

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 26s.; Country, 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s.

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, MARCH 13, 1875.

CURRENT TOPICS.

THE VACANT COUNTY COURT CIRCUIT No. 14 (Leeds) is to be filled by the joint appointment of Mr. Daniel, Q.C., judge of Circuit No. 11 (Bradford), and Mr. Serjeant Tindal Atkinson, judge of Circuit No. 12 (Halifax). A new judge will be appointed to the latter circuit, in order that Mr. Serjeant Tindal Atkinson may devote his undivided attention to the important common law business of the Leeds Circuit; but Mr. Daniel, Q.C., who is to take the equity and bankruptcy cases in the Leeds district, will retain his present position as judge of the Bradford Circuit. Some slight alteration will be made in the towns included in the circuits referred to. The inhabitants of the Leeds district are to be congratulated on an arrangement which will give them the benefit of the services of two experienced judges.

A QUESTION as to the lien upon the client's papers of a London solicitor acting as agent for a country solicitor came before the Lords Justices on Wednesday in *Vyse v. Foster*. An order had been obtained on behalf of the plaintiff discharging her solicitor on the record, who was a country solicitor, and substituting for him another solicitor. The London solicitor who had acted as agent for the original solicitor refused to give up the client's papers, on the ground that he had a lien upon them for the costs due to him from the country solicitor. The latter, however, deposed that he had always had in his hands moneys of the plaintiff's more than sufficient to satisfy what was due to him from her in respect of costs, and this evidence was uncontradicted. On this ground the Lords Justices affirmed an order which had been made by Vice-Chancellor Bacon for the delivering up of the papers by the London agent to the new solicitor. Their lordships pointed out that the London agent could have no higher right than his principal, there being no privity between the client and the agent, and that although the agent might, by giving notice to the client of his claim, entitle himself to assert a lien on the papers, in case the client should pay the solicitor after that notice had been given, still if the state of things was such that in law the solicitor was to be treated as having been already paid by the client, if the solicitor was in such a position that he could not sue for his costs, then the agent could be in no better position, and could claim no lien on the client's papers.

This decision may be useful as reminding London solicitors of the limits of their lien on such documents as come into their possession while acting as agents for solicitors in the country. The point, however, was previously covered by authority (see *Waller v. Holmes*, 9 W. R. 32, 1 J. & H. 239, and *Peatfield v. Barlow*, 17 W. R. 516, L. R. 8 Eq. 61), and the recent decision flows directly from the well-established principle that there is no privity between the original client and his solicitor's London agent. The dictum of the Lords Justices that the case would be otherwise if notice were given of the claim before the

client has paid his solicitor is also clearly in accordance with the authorities (see the same case of *Waller v. Holmes*).

A REPORT from the committee of the Birmingham Law Society, who on previous occasions have rendered valuable service by their criticisms, draws attention to a serious practical defect in the Land Transfer Bill. The clauses relating to the entry of caveats, or, as they are now called, cautions, have been retained substantially unaltered from the Bill of 1873, and they seem to be defective in other points besides those noticed by the Society. Our readers will remember that the scheme of these clauses is the following:—The caution is to be "lodged" with the registrar, and the result is to be that he is not thereafter, without the consent of the cautioner, to register any dealing with the land until he has given twenty-one days' notice to the cautioner. No means are provided for enabling the registered owner of the land to challenge the caution before any dealing with the land takes place, and no express power is given to the cautioner, before he has received notice, formally to withdraw his caution. When the twenty-one days have expired, the cautioner, in order to enforce his claim, must appear before the court and give a bond, with sufficient security, conditioned "to indemnify every party against any damage that may be sustained by reason of the dealing with the land being delayed," and the court may, thereupon, make an order delaying the registration of any dealing with the land. The defect to which the Birmingham Law Society draw attention is that to which we alluded last year (18 S. J. 449) when we remarked that a caveat really means only an opportunity to take proceedings in Chancery. If the Act is at all generally made use of, there must be large numbers of unregistered interests protected only by cautions, and every one must agree that great inconvenience will be the result if there is attached to every caution the incident, at some time or other, of giving security for unknown damages and plunging into a Chancery suit. The questions to be decided on cautions will, as the Society remark, be usually of an excessively simple description, and it is difficult to see why they should not, in the first instance at least, be disposed of by the registrar, the cautioner being empowered to give his bond and apply to the court only in case the registrar decides against him.

While on the subject of the Land Transfer Bill, we may note that in committee the curious clause (70) requiring the applicant for first registration, or the vendor, to enter into covenants for title with the registrar has disappeared from the Bill, and we regret to see that the clauses providing for payment of the district registrars by fees have also been dropped. We observe that the Birmingham Law Society endorse our suggestion that the last section of the Bill should be altered so as to repeal the 7th section of the Vendor and Purchaser Act, 1874, *ab initio*.

THE PRACTICE of employing unpaid commissioners to assist in the transaction of criminal business at the assizes is being carried to a length which deserves the serious attention of the Legislature. On one circuit a commissioner has been employed almost every day to try prisoners, and on one occasion two commissioners were sitting at the same time. On another circuit no fewer than four criminal courts had to be formed to get through the calendar, and two of them were presided over by Queen's Counsel. As a matter of fact it is not at all uncommon to have several commissioners sitting in subsidiary courts at assizes. The reason, of course, is that in arranging the circuits sufficient time is not allowed for the business, and this is due, partly to the difficulty of estimating beforehand the amount of work to be done, but principally to the fact that the judges' engagements will not permit of more time being given. The result is that the circuit judges, finding they have more

to get through than they can do in the time, apply to some Queen's Counsel to assist them. Professional *esprit de corps* and natural good feeling make it very difficult to refuse such a request, and upon exceptional occasions no one could find fault with the practice. But the extent to which it is carried amounts to a considerable hardship to the learned gentlemen who are thus stranded from employment as advocates and are practically obliged to give their gratuitous services. The commissioners are generally, it is true, selected from those members of the profession who, notwithstanding their ability and competence for their vocation, have, from various circumstances, failed to secure so large a share of business as others, but this does not diminish the hardship of exposing them to the responsibility and labour involved in trying prisoners, without any recompense other than the glory of being addressed as "my lord." All judicial work done by professional men ought in common fairness to be paid for, and commissioners employed at assizes should be awarded remuneration according to their professional *status*. If this were done we fancy the eyes of the Legislature would speedily opened to the amount of work entrusted to the commissioners, and a remedy might perhaps be devised which would render their employment unnecessary.

The present system, besides being unfair to the commissioners, is unsatisfactory to the public and the profession. We have no hesitation in stigmatizing the sort of scramble that takes place when an unexpected pressure of criminal business occurs at assizes as absolutely indecent. Courts have to sit in the grand jury room and other places, with an amount of informality and confusion that no one unacquainted with such scenes could possibly imagine. A great part of the effect of criminal justice depends upon its being administered with due formality and propriety, but this is impossible under the circumstances we describe. A great deal of the difficulty, no doubt, arises from the fact that in every place the judge has to clear the gaol, and consequently a number of small sessions offences are included in the calendar. Again, a number of the offences which must be tried at assizes consist of crimes which, though nominally of greater heinousness than sessions cases, are really trivial by comparison, such as trumpery burglaries. We have before suggested that the proper mode of dealing with this difficulty is by enlarging the jurisdiction of quarter sessions, and at the same time increasing their efficiency by securing competent professional men to preside over them.

A LETTER FROM A CORRESPONDENT signing himself "W. F. F.," apparently intended for the *Times*, has found a haven in the columns of a legal contemporary. The writer is obviously the same person who recently volunteered in the leading journal, with rather disastrous results to himself, to set Sir Henry James right as to Harecourt's case, and he now seeks to set us right as to the effect of a pardon under the Great Seal, which he thinks will not in all cases restore to the offender his *status* of credit. If it were necessary to go into this question at all, and if it were desirable to pronounce confident opinions on obscure questions of law on the strength of one or two *dicta* contained in works of authority, we might remind our critic that in *Male on Elections* (p. 35) it is stated that if a person attainted of treason or felony have received a pardon under the Great Seal, or had the benefit of clergy, or undergone the punishment for his offence, he is not ineligible [for election to Parliament] unless the House declare him so by express resolution, and this is cited and adopted in *Rogers on Elections*, 223; or we might quote from Hawkins, P. C. 547: "I take it to be settled at this day that the pardon of a treason or felony, even after a conviction or attainder, does so far clear the party from the infamy and all the other consequences of his crime that he may not only have an action for a scandal in calling him a traitor or felon after the time of his pardon but may also be a good witness notwithstanding

the attainder or conviction, because the pardon makes him, as it were, a new man and gives him a new capacity and credit" (see also the authorities cited in the margin); or we might refer to *Cuddington v. Wilkins* (Hob. 81) where the whole court resolved that, "when the King hath discharged it (felony) and pardoned him of it, he hath cleared the person of the crime and infamy," and the Chief Justice added (p. 82) that "the King's pardon doth not only clear the offence itself but all the dependencies, penalties, and disabilities incident to it." But in truth our critic, in his haste to display his research, has overlooked the principle which is always uppermost in a lawyer's mind when desirous of safely dealing with a practical question, viz., to go no farther than the solution of the actual matter in hand requires. The conclusion at which we arrived rendered it quite unnecessary for us to determine whether a pardon would have the effect of restoring the eligibility of the convict. We assumed, in accordance with the authorities we have quoted and with much that had been said in the House of Commons and elsewhere, that it might have that effect, but the substance of our statement was that, even assuming pardon or endurance of the sentence might have that effect, yet inasmuch as neither had occurred in the case of Mitchell, the ineligibility, if it existed at all, remained. It is perfectly obvious that it would have been irrelevant for us to go into any such question as that indicated by "W. F. F.," and we do not wish to be considered as having come to any conclusion with regard to the effect of a pardon on the *status* of discredit appertaining to a felon. It is to be observed that, even assuming that no pardon could restore the competency of the convict as a jurymen, it by no means necessarily follows, as "W. F. F." rashly assumes, that he would be ineligible for Parliament, for it would be necessary to see how far the eligibility of a person to Parliament stands on the same footing as his eligibility as a jurymen. As to this we are not called upon to give an opinion.

SO MUCH MISCONCEPTION has arisen as to the nature and effect of the recent decision of the Railway Commissioners in the case of the *Midland Railway Company v. The Great Western Railway Company* (which we reported last week, *ante*, p. 339), that it may be well to call attention to the words of the agreement upon which the reference to the arbitration of the Commissioners was based. It is well known that there is, "as a general rule, no active competition between railway companies in the matter of fares, but that, wherever different companies run between the same places, they arrange their prices" (report of Railway Amalgamation Committee, p. xxiv.). In some cases the arrangement is effected by an unwritten, in some by a written, and in others by a statutory agreement. The agreement in this particular case was statutory, being scheduled to an amalgamation Act passed in 1863 (26 & 27 Vict. c. cxlii.). One of the clauses (4) of the agreement was to this effect:—"The companies shall agree to equal rates, fares, and charges in every respect between competitive stations, such as Birmingham and London." The only other clause which came before the Commissioners was clause 29, which provided that "all questions of difference arising out of the agreement" should be determined by arbitration, and the jurisdiction of the Commissioners to arbitrate was undisputed. It is important to point out that the agreement not only mentioned no specific equal fares to begin with, but was utterly silent as to any basis of equality upon which the companies were to agree, or upon which the arbitrators were to proceed in determining the equal rate. The agreement pre-supposed, and the fluctuations of railway policy would obviously necessitate, a pretty constant variation of rates from time to time. This being so, the Midland Railway Company, under circumstances which are notorious, proposed a reduction of twenty-five per cent. upon first-class fares between certain competitive stations, which reduction the Great Western refused to

make. The two companies, therefore, not being able to "agree" under clause 4, came before the Commissioners, under clause 29, to have an agreement made for them as to the equal first-class rate between the competitive stations. We hope we have said enough to show how unfounded is the prevailing impression that the two companies were bound to charge specific fares by an agreement which neither of them was to alter without the consent of the other, and that the Commissioners allowed the Midland to break the agreement, as being contrary to public policy, or as being inapplicable to the altered circumstances supervening upon the Midland Railway Company having introduced two classes, whereas at the time of the agreement they had three.

THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE JUDICATURE BILL.

THE sudden, and most unexpected, collapse of the Judicature Bill has naturally given rise to surmises of the most conflicting kind. The only points on which public opinion seems at all agreed are, first, that the proceeding has been very damaging to the Government, politically; and secondly, that, *coûte qui coûte*, the Act of 1873 must not be allowed to come into operation without amendment. It would be absurd, it is felt, to permit the House of Lords to continue the final Court of Appeal for Ireland and Scotland after it has ceased to be so for England, and it would be intolerable to leave English suitors without further appeal at the mercy of the motley congeries of not improbably discordant "divisions" which compose "her Majesty's Court of Appeal," as constituted by that Act. Assuming, then, that "something must be done," three courses, as usual, present themselves for the choice of the Government. First, they may once more postpone the "commencement" of the Act of 1873, and thus leave things as they are for the present, and give themselves another year to find out what had best be done. Secondly, they may simply repeal section 20 of the Judicature Act, leaving the rest of that Act to come into operation at the time fixed by the Act of last session, the effect of which would be to leave a right of appeal to the House of Lords and Privy Council respectively in every case where such right now exists, but to substitute the new Court of Appeal for the Courts of Appeal in Chancery and Exchequer Chamber respectively, and to interpose it as a court of first appeal intermediate between the Court of Admiralty and the Privy Council. Or lastly, they may even yet bring in an amended proposal—and it could easily be an improvement upon that just withdrawn—for the completion of the reform commenced two years ago, and the establishment of a satisfactory Imperial Court of Appeal. The first course would be the easiest, and would be the least likely to encounter opposition, but its adoption would be a most humiliating confession of weakness and vacillation, and it would be, of the three, the course most inconvenient for the profession and the public. The profession would have to endure another twelve months of suspense and confusion, and that deferred anticipation which is so proverbially injurious, while the public would for the like period be deprived of the fruition of that immunity from conflicting jurisdictions which constitutes the sole practical advantage to be looked forward to, the one grain of wheat to be winnowed from this bushel of legislation.*

* It has been over and over again pointed out, in this journal, that this advantage could have been obtained far more simply and effectually without any alteration in the constitution or machinery of the existing courts; but it seems to have been considered desirable, perhaps with good reason, to utilize the opportunity afforded by the admitted imperfection of our system in this respect, for the removal of those theoretical anomalies, the *vis inertiae* of which we could not otherwise have overcome. Hence it follows that to delay the desired "fusion" of jurisdictions because we have not yet settled the form of the new tribunals, is to sacrifice the principal to the accessory.

The second of the courses above mentioned has the advantage of simplicity and completeness, but it is open to the charge of retrogression, and would, doubtless, on that account meet with formidable opposition. It would, however, be so very superior to mere postponement of the evil day, that we earnestly hope that the Lord Chancellor, should his choice be unhappily confined to these alternatives, will not permit himself to be frightened or persuaded into the suggested procrastination; and indeed the proposal is not without some positive recommendations. The principle of Lord Selborne's Act, so far as regards this question, was the abolition of double appeals, and this principle has been with singular unanimity dissented from alike by the people and the profession. In this the Lord Chancellor seems thoroughly to concur, but the unhappy deference which he has thought fit to pay to the views of his official predecessor operates to prevent him from carrying out fairly his own more statesmanlike ideas. The machinery of one great court of appeal, composed of a large number of co-ordinate judges, though well adapted for the purposes of intermediate appeals—in which point of view we consider it decidedly superior to the existing courts—was neither fitted nor designed for performing the functions of such a single court of last resort as is now admitted to be required; and the attempt to convert a portion of this court into a court of appeal from the rest, without disturbing the unity of the court or the equality of the judges *inter se*, ingenious as it was, was so fundamentally absurd—with all deference to the Lord Chancellor—that the best fate it could hope for was that *immediate* failure with which it has met. It would, therefore, be no slight gain to break at once with the machinery, as well as the principle, of Lord Selborne's Act, and by restoring for the present the supreme jurisdiction of the House of Lords, pronounce clearly that the court of last resort for the future, however it may be constituted, shall be something essentially distinct from, and superior to, the court of intermediate appeal.

If this course be adopted, we hope that it will be adopted *simpliciter*; that no attempt will be made to tack on to this repeal any artificial strengthening of the House of Lords such as has been suggested by Lord Penzance, the only possible effect of which would be to lower the prestige of the House without increasing the efficiency of the Court. The peculiar excellence of the House as a court of appeal, that which almost redeemed its many defects of constitution and procedure, was and is its extreme selectness. This characteristic has been, indeed, at times pushed too far, and we have no desire ever to see again—as we have seen not so very long ago—a single judge and two lay figures sitting as the supreme court of appeal; but the presumption almost amounts to certainty that the House can never contain more than five or six law lords at any one time, and these will generally be—or at any rate include—the most capable lawyers whom the country can produce, and thus we, at any rate, secure a single court whose members shall have the highest attainable qualifications. An infusion of eighteen or twenty judges into this court would lower the whole to the average of the judicial capacity of the country, and thus deprive it of the pre-eminent ability on which alone its claim to maintain its present jurisdiction depends. The most vehement opponent of the jurisdiction of the House could wish it no worse than to see it thus "*propter vitam vivendi perdere causas.*"

If, however, the Government really desire to retrieve their position, inevitably damaged as it has been by the withdrawal of the Bill, and vindicate their character for far-sightedness and statesmanship, upon which that proceeding has cast grave suspicion, they will not hesitate to adopt the third course we have suggested, and will at once come forward with a proposal to create a strong, single, satisfactory court of last appeal, which shall unite the judicial eminence of the House of Lords to the convenience

of procedure of the Judicial Committee, and surpass both in the completeness and symmetry of its representative character. Such a court would not be far to seek: were it not invidious the first judges might be here named without fear of contradiction; and the principles on which vacancies should be filled up have been discussed in our pages *usque ad nauseam*. Some things it must not be; it must not be a "division" temporarily detached from an inferior court; it must not be a revival of the Exchequer Chamber sitting in appeal upon the decisions of judges of equal authority with its own members: it must not be a decorated victim, sacrificed to the vanity of *ex officio* judges, who have, or ought to have, enough to do in the courts of first instance; it must not be left dependent upon voluntary attendances from a niggardly disinclination—unshared by the community—to secure superiority of attainment by superiority of reward. A court of not more than nine judges, which shall include, as of right, every ex-Chancellor of Great Britain not expressly exempted from attendance, and shall necessarily number amongst its members the most pre-eminent of the Irish, Scotch, and colonial judges, to which no case shall be brought which has not already undergone the ordeal of a double discussion, and by which no case shall be disposed of without having been considered by at least five such judges as we have described, would command all the respect and confidence now possessed by the House of Lords, and would harmonize admirably with the present great attempt at judicial symmetry. If it be attempted to link the future with the past by any notion of recommendation or report, such as that which now obtains at the Judicial Committee, although we "set no store by" any so transparent fiction, we should never think of offering any opposition to its adoption.

EXECUTORS' RIGHT OF RETAINER.

I.

THE right of the executor to retain a debt due to him from his testator as against debts of equal degree is among the most ancient doctrines of the law. In the reign of Henry IV. the right seems to have been well settled, for in a case which then arose (see Plow. 185) Hull, J., is reported to have remarked that if the executor "did not retain to pay himself, he might have retained, and therefore it shall be said his folly that he did not." In the case of *Dive v. Langston*, in 19 Henry VII., the right was again affirmed; and in *Woodward v. Darcy*, in 4 & 5 Ph. & Mary (Plow. 184), the grounds upon which it is founded were fully discussed by the judges: Brook, C.J., was against the right, but the other judges of both benches decided in favour of it, among other reasons, because "it cannot be supposed but that the testator, who requires that his debts shall be paid to every man, intended that his debts to his executor should be paid, and that more especially than others, because it is to be presumed he was his chief friend, in that he reposes his greatest confidence in him by making him his executor. So that if the execution of the administration should extinguish the debt, this would be derogatory to testaments, and to the souls of testators—to testaments, for that executors would refuse rather than lose their debts . . . and to the souls of testators for that if the executor takes upon him the administration, which is an act of charity, then thereby the just debt due from the testator to the executor would remain for ever unpaid, which would be dangerous for the soul of the testator." A reason of a more practical character for the doctrine is given by Verney, M.R., in *Chapman v. Towner* (Vin. Abr. Exors. D. 2, pl. 2): "The true reason is because if a retainer were not allowed, an executor, in case of a deficiency of assets, would have no possible way of obtaining satisfaction for his debts, for at law there is no such thing as splitting of debts or making a rateable proportion, and therefore he cannot come in upon an average with the rest of the creditors, nor have the ad-

vantage of another creditor, who by bringing his action in due time may recover his debt though there be not enough assets at last to answer all demands upon the testator; for he cannot sue himself. So that this privilege of retainer is founded on the policy of the common law, that executors may not be deprived of one advantage without having another in lieu of it."

The legal right of retainer was extended in *Plumer v. Marchant* (3 Bur. 1380) to debts due to the executor as a trustee for another, and the principle was laid down that wherever the executor may be sued he may retain. And in *Loane v. Casey* (2 W. Bl. 965) the rule was enunciated that wherever an executor has a right to a sum of money, whether it be strictly a debt due to himself or nominally to another, he may retain it. This latter rule, though often cited, does not appear to have been acted upon at common law, and it is opposed to the *dicta* in *Roskelley v. Godolphin* (Sir T. Raym. 484) and *Marriot v. Thompson* (Willes, 186) that if the debts in those cases had been to be paid to trustees, though in trust for the executrix, she could not have retained in respect of them. And in *Thompson v. Thompson* (9 Price, 464) the Court of Exchequer refused to allow the retainer by a wife, who was appointed executrix, of a sum payable by her husband to a trustee to satisfy an annuity to her for her life, remarking that the circumstance that the *corpus* was to be paid to the trustee was sufficient to distinguish it from all the other cases. The rule that wherever an executor might be sued he may retain, is illustrated by the case of *De Tastet v. Shaw* (1 B. & A. 664) where it was held that the executor could not retain in respect of a debt constituting an item in a partnership account, because, as Lord Ellenborough explained, "justice cannot be administered without affording the plaintiff an opportunity of controverting the amount of the debt," and that could not be done by an issue to be tried by a jury. At law, therefore, the debt could not be ascertained, and consequently could not be retained.

In cases where there existed a legal right to retain it was early held that equity would not take away that right (*Chapman v. Towner*, Vin. Abr. Exors. D. 2, pl. 2). "The rule of this court," said the Master of the Rolls in that case, "in cases of retainer is, unless the party can show a legal right to retain we never give it him; if he can show a legal right we never take it away from him." And in *Hopton v. Dryden* (Prec. Ch. 179) the Lord Keeper (Wright) laid it down that equity will never assist a retainer, and that in the case of equitable assets it will not be permitted. This latter rule, notwithstanding an apparent deviation in *Hall v. Macdonald* (14 Sim. 1), is still observed (see *Bain v. Sadler*, L. R. 12 Eq. 570). But in spite of the doctrine that equity will not assist a retainer, and will not give a right of retainer unless the party can show a legal right to retain, the courts at Lincoln's-Inn have certainly gone farther than the common law courts in admitting the right to retain in respect of debts due to another as trustee for the executor. Thus in *Cockcroft v. Black* (2 P. Wms. 298) Lord Chancellor King held that although in strictness of law the executrix could not retain, the bond not being made to herself, yet since she might "pay what bond she pleased first, and as it would be a vain thing for her to pay to her own trustee with one hand and take it back from him with the other, the bond made to the trustee should be the same in equity as if made to herself."

A very recent decision shows how, by adopting the common law principle of retainer, that right will be allowed in equity when it could not be claimed at law. In the case referred to (*In re Morris's Estate*, 23 W. R. 331, L. R. 10 Ch. 68) it was contended that as courts of equity only allow the right of retainer where it is allowed at law, and as at law a partnership debt could not be ascertained for want of machinery, and therefore, under *De Tastet v. Shaw*, could not be the subject of retainer, so in equity, although the debt could be ascertained, the retainer could not be allowed.

But the Lords Justices, in affirming the decision of Hall, V.C. (22 W. R. 729), allowing the right of retainer, remarked that the executor's right of retainer being a right in respect of the thing itself, which is the debt, and that right being incapable of being exercised through defect of machinery in the court of law, it would be "a monstrous violation of common sense and common justice" to refuse the machinery of courts of equity to supply the defect. It would certainly be strange to hold that, though the debt could be ascertained, the impossibility of ascertaining the debt, which is the foundation of the reason why the right of retainer in respect of such debt is not allowed at law, should continue to operate in equity. But the decision is, as we have said, to be noted as adding to the cases in which retainer is allowed in equity but not at law.

THE CLERKSHIPS OF THE PARLIAMENTS AND PRIVY COUNCIL.

The resignation of Sir John Shaw Lefevre and the death of Sir Arthur Helps have deprived the public service of two very efficient officers and have placed in the hands of the Ministry two very valuable pieces of patronage. Both offices are posts of great dignity and antiquity. The clerk of the Parliaments is appointed by the Crown by letters patent, and his duties are of a very varied nature. He summons all witnesses whose attendance may be required before the House of Lords and certifies their expenses; exercises a general control and supervision over the taxing masters of the House and authenticates all extracts from the Lords' Journals. But, his most important functions relate to the passing of Bills and the giving of the Royal assent. He indorses upon all Bills the consent of the House to their passing or amendment, and (except in the case of money Bills) he retains the custody of them until the time arrives for their receiving the Royal assent. In cases where the Royal assent is given in person upon the day of prorogation the Clerk of the Parliaments waits upon the Queen in the robing-room, reads the list of Bills, and receives the Royal commands; but in cases where the assent is given by commission the titles of the Bills are read by the Clerk of the Crown, and the Clerk of the Parliaments then signifies the Royal assent in Norman-French. In all cases it is the duty of the latter official to indorse the date of assent upon the Bills. He also settles and draws up all decrees and orders made by the House on the determination of appeals.

Upon his appointment the clerk of the Parliaments formally took an oath in the following form:—"Ye shall be true, faithful, and trouth ye shall bear to our Sovereign Lady the Queen and to her heirs and successors; ye shall nothing know that shall be prejudicial to her Highness, her Crown, Estate, and Dignity Royal, but that ye shall resist it to your power, and with all speed ye shall advertise her Grace thereof, or at the least some of her Council in such wise as the same may come to her knowledge; ye shall also well and truly serve her Highness in the office of clerk of her Parliaments, making true entries and records of the things done and passed in the same; ye shall keep secret all such matters as shall be treated in her said Parliaments, and not disclose the same before they shall be published, but to such as it ought to be disclosed unto; and generally ye shall well and truly do and execute all things belonging to you to be done appertaining to the office of clerk of the Parliaments. As God help you, &c."

The office appears formerly to have been tenable for life, and it was the practice also to grant it in reversion. Thus, by letters patent, dated the 24th day of February, 1783, the office was granted to Samuel Strutt, Esq., "to have, enjoy, and exercise the said office unto him by himself or his sufficient deputy or deputies for the term of his natural life," on the decease of Ashley Cowper,

Esq., or when the office should first become vacant. The office was also granted to George Rose, Esq., on the same terms, after the decease of the said Ashley Cowper and Samuel Strutt; and by letters patent, dated the 24th day of October, 1795, reciting the deaths of the said Ashley Cowper and Samuel Strutt, and that George Rose was in possession of the office, the reversion was granted to George Henry Rose, Esq. (the son of the latter), on the death of the said George Rose, with a salary of £40 a year in addition to "all other profits, advantages, pre-eminences, and emoluments whatsoever and howsoever belonging or appertaining to the said office." Under the above patent the late Sir George Henry Rose succeeded to the office upon his father's death in March, 1818. In 1824, however, an Act was passed for placing the office on a different footing, making it no longer tenable for life, and withdrawing the patronage which the clerk had theretofore enjoyed. The statute 5 Geo. 4, c. 82, after reciting the above letters patent, and that Sir G. H. Rose had consented to relinquish the right of appointing the clerks in his office, enacted that on the expiration of the existing letters patent the then clerk assistant should become Clerk of the Parliaments, and execute the duties in person, and be removable by address of the House of Lords, all future holders of the office to be appointed by the Crown upon the same terms. The appointment of the clerk assistant and other clerks at the table (after reserving one turn for Sir G. H. Rose) was by the same statute vested in the Lord Chancellor. Under this statute Sir J. S. Lefevre succeeded to the Clerkship to the Parliaments on Sir G. H. Rose's death, and was thus the first occupier of the post who made the performance of the duties a reality.

The clerkship of the Privy Council is also a very ancient post, though the actual importance of the office was gradually curtailed by the encroachment of the jurisdiction of Parliament upon that of the Privy Council. On the other hand the labours of the post have been very greatly increased by the powers which various Acts of Parliament have conferred upon the Queen in Council. The clerk is appointed by letters patent, under the Great Seal, and holds office during pleasure. He is *ex officio* secretary of all the committees of the council, attends all council meetings, administers the oath to Privy Counsellors, and frames all orders, minutes, and proceedings. As in the case of the Clerk of the Parliaments the ancient form of oath is still retained. It is this:—"You shall swear to be a true and faithful servant unto the Queen's Majesty, in the exercise of the functions of the clerk of the Privy Council in ordinary; you shall not know or understand of any matter or thing to be attempted, done, or spoken against her Majesty's Person, Honour, Crown, or Dignity Royal; but you shall lett and withstand the same to the uttermost of your power and either do or cause it to be revealed, either to her Majesty herself, or to the Privy Council. You shall keep secret all matters committed and revealed unto you, or that shall be treated of secretly in Council, and if any of the said treaties or councils shall touch any of the counsellors, you shall not reveal it unto him, but shall keep the same until such time as, by the consent of her Majesty, or by the Council, publication shall be made thereof; you shall to your uttermost bear faith and allegiance to the Queen's Majesty, and shall assist, and defend all jurisdictions, pre-eminences, and authorities granted to her Majesty, and annexed to the Crown by Act of Parliament or otherwise against all Foreign Princes, Persons, Prelates, States, or Potentates. And generally in all things you shall do as a faithful and true servant and subject ought to do to her Majesty. So help you God, and by the Holy Contents of this Book."

There were formerly two clerks of the Council, but on the death of the late Mr. Greville no fresh appointment was made. Mr. Greville and his colleague (the present Earl Bathurst) both obtained their clerkships in reversion before an actual vacancy had occurred.

Recent Decisions.

COMMON LAW.

COMPANY—PROMOTERS' EXPENSES.

Melhado v. The Porto Allegre, New Hamburg, and Brazilian Railway Company, C.P., 23 W. R. 57.

When a company is incorporated by a special Act, it has long been the usage to introduce a clause providing for the payment of the expenses of promotion. This gives to those who have incurred those expenses a statutory security; but, in the absence of such a provision, it has been long settled that they have no remedy, since there could be no contract with a company before it existed, nor any subsequent ratification of an agency which could not exist, nor any obligation to pay for services on the ground that the company had adopted the benefit of them, since an existing company could not exercise an option whether they should or should not have come into existence.

The same difficulty occurs with companies formed and incorporated under the Companies Act, 1862, and accordingly a similar practice has prevailed of inserting in the articles of association a clause empowering the directors to pay a certain sum of money to the promoters for promotion expenses. Here, however, the statutory force which such a clause has in a special Act is wanting, and the remedy of the promoters depends upon the application of the ordinary principles of law. The form of these clauses varies; sometimes they amount to an absolute direction to the directors to pay a sum of money to the promoters, sometimes to a discretionary power, and in *Touche v. Metropolitan Railway Warehousing Company* (L. R. 6 Ch. 671) a clause in the former shape was held to amount, in substance, to the creation of a trust in favour of the promoters, which could be enforced against the company. Considering that there was no specific fund created, that, whatever the form of expression, such a clause is, in fact, nothing but an authority to the directors to pay a sum of money, and that this authority is not founded upon any contract between the company and the promoters, the decision certainly goes a long way, and gives, perhaps, an unnecessary sanction to the vicious practice of the promotion of companies by persons who do not become members of the company, and take no responsibility upon them in its management. But however this may be, the decision affords no ground for the further attempt to create out of such a clause a contract between the company and the promoters, who are no parties to the articles of association. The present case, following the decision in *Gunn v. London and Lancashire Fire Insurance Company* (12 C. B. N. S. 694), the principle of which was recognized in *Kelner v. Buxter* (15 W. R. 278, L. R. 2 C. P. 174), is a distinct authority against the success of such an attempt.

Reviews.

USAGES AND CUSTOMS.

THE LAW OF USAGES AND CUSTOMS: A Practical Law Tract.
By J. H. BALFOUR BROWNE, Barrister-at-Law. Stevens & Haynes.

We turned to this book with much expectation of pleasure, for the subject is one which seems to afford scope for a treatise of no ordinary interest. And at the present time especially, when so much attention is directed to the terms of agricultural tenancies, a work discussing clearly, carefully, and minutely the extent to which the custom of the country has been rendered an implied obligation created by the mere relation of landlord and tenant, not merely with reference to decided cases, but also with regard to the probability of future

modifications of the doctrine, would have been of great value. We shall state hereafter how far our expectations have been fulfilled, but at the outset we must confess ourselves a little perplexed to understand the exact scope of the work, as indicated by the first and subsequent chapters. Mr. Browne tells us (p. 13) that "a usage of immemorial observance which has received judicial sanction" is undeserving of the appellation custom, which he "would reserve for law when it is being modelled in clay—so to speak—and before it has been transferred to the marble. Custom seems to us to be applicable to the law before it has been recognized as law, but when it is in a condition to claim judicial sanction." This we take to refer to such usages as must be proved, and which upon being proved may be held to form implied terms in contracts. The object of the author is stated (p. 14) to be "to state the law which is applicable to such usages and customs; the rules of evidence which will enable the practitioner to determine the existence of an alleged custom; the rules of law which will enable him to determine its legality when its existence is established; and the rules which will enable him to put the correct legal construction upon it." Yet the first rule given as to the validity of a custom is (p. 15) that it must have been used so long that the memory of man runneth not to the contrary—a proposition, of course, perfectly true of a custom in the strictest sense, but certainly inapplicable, as he himself very properly afterwards points out (p. 54), to the usages to which he devotes the rest of his book. It would almost seem that this chapter, "On Customs Generally," was intended as an introduction to a work of wider scope than that which has been ultimately written.

In the next chapter Mr. Browne divides the real subject of his book—viz., the effect of evidence of usage in annexing incidents to contracts—into three parts: (1) landlord and tenant; (2) contracts made in the course of trade; and (3) other contracts. Upon the first branch he has been diligent in the collection of cases, but we cannot say that his mode of dealing with them throws much new light on the subject. After stating *Wigglesworth v. Dallison*, and omitting in this place to mention the essential fact that the lease in that case was entirely silent as to the away-going crop, he gives a long extract from the judgment of Parke, B., in *Hutton v. Warren*, and states briefly the effect of the decisions relating to the implied incorporation of terms and explanation of words by the custom of the country. We readily admit that this digest may be useful to many readers; but we cannot help expressing our regret that Mr. Browne should have contented himself with doing what has often been done before. His attempt to base the admission of evidence of the custom of the country on the ground of a latent ambiguity, the "ambiguity of silence," is certainly, so far as we know, novel, but does he not dispose of his own theory when he says, with reference to usages of trade (p. 60), that evidence of such usage "was allowed not only to explain but to add a tacitly implied incident to the contract in addition to those which were expressed"? It seems an abuse of words to call this, which is most often done by evidence of the custom of the country, the explanation of an ambiguity. Is it necessary to seek for any other principle of admission of evidence in these cases than that given by Parke, B., in *Hutton v. Warren*, that in transactions in which known usages have been established and prevailed, there is a presumption that the parties did not mean to express in writing the whole of the contract by which they intended to be bound, but to contract with reference to those known usages?

The remainder of the book is devoted to the usages of trade and the laws of evidence relating to them. In the introduction to this chapter there are some well-compressed remarks as to the method of proof, which ought properly, we think, to have preceded the chapter on customs of the country. Then follows a digest of the cases, arranged under the headings of (1) usage explain-

ing the contract; and (2) usage adding terms to written contracts. The distinction is, no doubt, as Mr. Browne says, difficult to maintain, but it can hardly be necessary to notice the same case under both heads, as is done at pp. 60 and 75 with reference to *Grant v. Maddox* (15 M. & W. 737). Moreover, why should *Phillips v. Briard* (1 H. & N. 21) be both stated at length, on p. 81, as one of the "cases which strike one as anomalous and suggest the defectiveness of the principles under which they were decided," and again be stated on p. 85 as an illustration of the principle that the terms added by parol evidence to a written contract must be really incidental to it? And what have the conditions which by law are implied in contracts for sale and on leases (referred to on p. 95), to do with proof of usage? As to this chapter, equally with the former, we must remark that, to accomplish the object Mr. Browne seems to have in view of contributing to the definite settlement of the main questions connected with the subject, a much more elaborate treatment than he has attempted is necessary. Many parts of the book may be read with interest, but we cannot pronounce it a contribution of any great value to legal literature.

CONVEYANCING STATUTES.

A SHORT EPILOGUE OF THE PRINCIPAL STATUTES RELATING TO CONVEYANCING. Second edition. By GEORGE NICHOLS MARCY, Barrister-at-Law. Davis & Son.

This new edition of Mr. Marcy's useful little work appears in a somewhat enlarged form, the number of the older Acts epitomized having been increased, and the legislation of last session affecting conveyancing having been added. It now constitutes an excellent compendium for the budding conveyancer of the statutes he ought to know. We observe with some surprise, however, that no epitome is given of any part of the Judicature Act, 1873. Surely in a summary of conveyancing statutes some of the sub-sections of section 25, relating to the rules of law on certain points, ought to have been given. It is true that they are not yet in force, but we notice that the Limitation Act of last session, which does not come into operation until 1879, is given in its proper place.

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION QUESTIONS.

A DIGEST OF THE PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION QUESTIONS IN ENGLISH GRAMMAR, HISTORY, GEOGRAPHY, LATIN GRAMMAR, ARITHMETIC, AND FRENCH GRAMMAR, WITH THE ANSWERS. By EDWARD HENSLÖWE BEDFORD, Solicitor. Stevens & Sons.

If these are fair specimens—as, of course, they must be—of the questions asked at the preliminary examination, we must confess that it is a more severe test than we had supposed. Would a candidate, for instance, expect to be asked, under the head of English grammar, "Was the Anglo-Saxon inflected"? The nature of the book seems to be explained by the title, and we need only add that the few answers we have examined are full and accurate.

REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS AND DEATHS.

THE LAW CONCERNING THE REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS AND DEATHS IN ENGLAND AND WALES, AND AT SEA, &c. By ARTHUR JOHN FLAXMAN, Barrister-at-law. Stevens & Haynes.

We need not say more of this little work than that it contains the whole statute law on the subject of which it treats, and that the notes appended to the different sections appear to be sensible and practical.

In the House of Commons on Tuesday, Mr. Lopes announced that he should not re-introduce the Jury Bill this session.

Notes.

BEFORE THE BANKRUPTCY ACT of 1869 adjudications of bankruptcy were made against traders *ex parte*, the bankrupt having an opportunity, after the adjudication was made, of showing cause against its validity. But section 8 of the Act of 1869 provides generally that a bankruptcy petition "shall be served in the prescribed manner," and the 60th and 61st rules of 1870 provide that the petition shall be personally served on the debtor, or that, if personal service cannot be effected, and the court is satisfied by affidavit that the debtor is keeping out of the way to avoid service, substituted service may be ordered. In one case only, viz., in the case of a trader, where the act of bankruptcy alleged is that he has departed from his dwelling-house or otherwise absented himself, rule 65 provides that "the petition may be heard forthwith on a sealed copy of the petition being left at the usual or last-known place of residence or business of the debtor." But even in that case it has been decided that if the debtor appears upon the hearing of the petition, he is entitled to insist that the proceedings shall be conducted in the ordinary course (*Re Brelas*, 19 W. R. 1106, L. R. 6 Ch. 894). In *Ex parte Stebbing*, heard by the Chief Judge on Monday, the question was raised whether, when an adjudication is made under the provisions of rule 266, it can be made *ex parte*. That rule (the effect of which has been much discussed in several recent cases, such as *Ex parte Ashworth*, 22 W. R. 925, L. R. 18 Eq. 705, and *Ex parte Foster*, 23 W. R. 145, L. R. 10 Ch. 59) gives the court power to adjudicate a debtor bankrupt with a view to the protection of his property in the interval between the filing of a liquidation petition and the passing of some resolution by the creditors, and the rule provides that all proceedings under the order of adjudication in such a case shall be stayed immediately on the making thereof, and until the creditors shall have passed some resolution in reference to liquidation by arrangement or composition. This rule says nothing about notice to the debtor. Rule 267, on the other hand, provides that if the creditors neglect to pass any resolution under the liquidation petition, the court may, on the application of any of the creditors, and *after notice* to the debtor, make an order of adjudication against the debtor, or direct the bankruptcy to be proceeded with, as the case may be. In *Ex parte Stebbing* the first meeting of the creditors under a liquidation petition was held on the 13th of February, and was then adjourned to the 20th of February. On the 19th of February one of the creditors presented a bankruptcy petition, founded on the filing of the liquidation petition, and the same day the registrar adjudicated the debtor a bankrupt, without any notice of the petition having been given to him, and there being nothing to bring the case within rule 65. In support of the adjudication, reliance was placed on the difference in the language of rules 266 and 267, the latter speaking of notice to the debtor, the former making no mention of it. The Chief Judge, however, was clearly of opinion that notice of the petition ought to have been given to the debtor, and he annulled the adjudication as having been irregularly obtained.

THE COURT OF APPEAL at Paris gave judgment on February 8 in a case calculated to excite lively interest among authors, whose feelings are often outraged by seeing their productions exposed for sale at a reduced rate in secondhand bookshops. M. Palmé had published an edition of the *Acta Sanctorum*, which met with much approval from leading literary men, but failed to meet with the more substantial support of numerous purchasers. It occurred to M. Palmé that this was due to the circumstance that a firm of secondhand booksellers published advertisements and catalogues in which they offered the book at a lower rate than that at which it was published. He accordingly took proceedings before the Chamber of Commerce against these booksellers, on the ground that they exercised an unfair competition, and he adduced in support of this contention proof that the secondhand booksellers had not always been able to supply copies of the *Acta* in pursuance of their advertisements, whence he argued that these advertisements were merely intended

to depreciate the work. The booksellers, in reply, contended that they had done nothing but exercise their trade in the ordinary way, and that M. Palmé himself was the real cause of the depreciation of his book. They alleged that he was in the habit of arranging for the performance of masses in the country for overburdened city churches, and of paying for these performances in copies of the *Acta Sanctorum*, which, being speedily converted into cash, glutted the market. The Tribunal of Commerce declared that the booksellers had carried on their trade in a perfectly legitimate manner, and that the prejudice which had resulted to M. Palmé was not the subject of compensation, and condemned him to bear the costs of the proceedings. M. Palmé appealed from this decision, and the case was argued at great length by M. Horace Helbronner, advocate, on his behalf, but the Court of Appeal confirmed the decision of the court below.

A DIFFICULT AND DELICATE QUESTION has recently come before the law officers of the United States. It appears that, under the provisions of an existing statute, no portrait is to be placed on any of the bonds, securities, notes, fractional or postal currency of the United States while the original of such portrait is living. The question has been recently raised whether engraving the portraits of living celebrities upon internal revenue stamps is prohibited by this enactment. The *Albany Law Journal* reports that, after due consideration, the Attorney-General has reached the conclusion that the law does not prohibit such portraits on internal revenue stamps. This must be satisfactory to the celebrities in question, and it affords a hint to our own Inland Revenue Commissioners of a mode in which they might pay a neat compliment to eminent personages. A well-executed medallion of the Lord Chancellor for the time being, impressed on the ordinary *ad valorem* stamp, would add interest to the examination of stamps on the comparison of abstracts with the deeds.

WE NOTICED last week (p. 335) the diversity of opinion in the three Irish Courts of Common Law as to the effect of the Judgments Extension Act, 1868 (31 & 32 Vict. c. 54), upon the practice of demanding security for costs from a plaintiff resident in another part of the United Kingdom. The point has again come before the Irish Court of Queen's Bench on an application, in an action for slander, for security for costs against a plaintiff resident in England (*Yorke v. M'Laughlin*, 8 Ir. R. C. L. 547). The court refused the application, declining to be bound by the decisions of the other two courts, but adhering to the authority of the English case of *Raeburn v. Andrews* (22 W. R. 489), and their own previous judgment in *White v. Carroll*, (8 Ir. R. C. L. 316). Barry, J., added that as the question had been "the subject of an express and well-considered judgment in England" it was "undesirable that a reciprocal practice should not be adopted."

IN THE CASE OF *Ex parte Barron*, heard by the Lords Justices on Thursday, a debtor's summons had been issued by some merchants, who resided in Spain, against an Englishman. The affidavit in support of the summons was not made by the creditors, but was made by their agent in England, who acted under a power of attorney from them. The debtor denied the alleged debt, and applied to the court to dismiss the summons, and he gave notice to the creditors that he required them to attend in the London Court of Bankruptcy, on the hearing of his application, for the purpose of being examined as to the alleged debt. They did not attend, and the registrar adjourned the hearing for a month, being of opinion that the debtor was entitled as a matter of right to require their presence. The Lords Justices were clearly of opinion that the debtor had no such right. The debt being denied, of course the summoning creditors would have to satisfy the court that they had at any rate a *prima facie* case, so that the question might be ordered to be tried. If they were not present upon the hearing of the application to dismiss the summons, then the debtor would have the advantage of the matter being determined upon his uncontradicted statements. But it would be a great hardship if, when the summoning creditors had made no affidavit on which they could be cross-examined, the debtor should be able to compel them to come from any part of the world merely because he wished to get evidence from them.

A POINT OF PRACTICE as to a debtor's summons also arose in *Ex parte Barron*. Four creditors joined in issuing one summons. The debts of two of them were each above £50; the debts of the other two were each less than £50. The summons warned the debtor that, unless within twenty-one days from service he paid the four debts to the four creditors, or compounded for the same to their satisfaction, he would have committed an act of bankruptcy in respect of which he might be adjudged a bankrupt on a bankruptcy petition being presented by the four creditors, unless he should have applied to the court to dismiss the summons. The summoned debtor denied the debts, and applied to the court to dismiss the summons. On the hearing of this application the debtor's solicitor undertook, on his behalf, to pay, within three days, one of the debts for which a judgment had been recovered, and an order was made staying the proceedings on the summons with respect to the other three debts pending the trial of their validity. As to one of the three debts the debtor was required to give security; as to the other two, no security was required. The debt of the judgment creditor not having been paid, he alone presented a bankruptcy petition. The Lords Justices expressed a doubt whether a number of creditors are entitled to join together in this way in issuing one debtor's summons. Section 6 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, provides that a single creditor for £50, or two or more creditors whose debts make up £50, may present a bankruptcy petition, alleging the commission of certain acts of bankruptcy, one of which is (sub-section 6) that "the creditor presenting the petition" has served a debtor's summons which has not been complied with. Section 7, which prescribes the method of procedure in relation to a debtor's summons, speaks only of one creditor. On the other hand, the form (No. 4) of debtor's summons, given in the schedule to the rules of 1870, evidently contemplates that the summons may be issued by more creditors than one, joining together for the purpose. But the Lords Justices were clearly of opinion that if several creditors unite in issuing one summons they are united for better or for worse in all the proceedings upon it. They must stand or fall together. There can be but one act of bankruptcy and one petition for adjudication founded upon it, and one of the creditors is not entitled to present his petition independently. It seems probable that this decision will have the effect of altering what has hitherto been the practice with regard to debtor's summonses.

IN ANOTHER CASE OF *Ex parte Kibble*, heard the same day, a question arose upon the construction of the Infants' Relief Act, 1874 (37 & 38 Vict. c. 62). By section 2 it is enacted that "no action shall be brought whereby to charge any person upon any promise made after full age to pay any debt contracted during infancy, or upon any ratification made after full age of any promise or contract made during infancy, whether there shall or shall not be any new consideration for such promise or ratification after full age." The court held that this section operates to make void the ratification by a person who attained twenty-one after the passing of the Act of a contract which he entered into during his infancy, but before the Act passed. In *Ex parte Kibble* an infant had drawn a bill of exchange which matured a month after the Act came into operation. He attained twenty-one a few days after the passing of the Act. The bill was dishonoured, and an action was subsequently commenced against him under the Bills of Exchange Act. He did not appear, and judgment went against him by default. A debtor's summons was issued on the judgment debt and a bankruptcy petition followed. The Lords Justices held that, the Court of Bankruptcy being, according to a well-settled rule, entitled to go behind the judgment, and to inquire into the consideration for the debt, the effect of section 2 of the Act of 1874 is to render it impossible that a contract entered into during infancy can be ratified by a person who attains full age after the passing of this Act, even though the contract had been made before the passing of the Act. This being so, the fact that judgment had been allowed to go by default could have no effect, and the result was that the debt was one without consideration, and incapable of supporting a bankruptcy petition.

THE LAND TRANSFER BILL.

THE following report has been issued by the committee of the Birmingham Law Society:—

As this measure is identical in its principles with the Land Titles and Transfer Bill of 1874, which was so thoroughly discussed by all the law societies, we deem it unnecessary to explain at length, as we have done in our former reports, the details of the system of registration of title. We propose to confine ourselves to pointing out the chief differences between this and the former proposals, and to note the more important points in which the present Bill appears to us capable of further improvement.

First.—In the thorough revision which the measure has undergone since last session there is a manifest intention to make registration popular and successful by making its terms as easy as possible. A very striking example of this is afforded by the provisions of s. 17, which, in place of the elaborate requirements of the Bill of 1874 as to form of application, accompanied by maps, and followed by statutory requirements of advertisements and notices, simply provides that the examination of title shall be conducted in the prescribed manner, "provided that due notice shall be given and sufficient opportunity be afforded to any person desirous of objecting." And as to boundaries, s. 84 (5) provides that the land shall be "described in such manner as the registrar thinks best calculated to secure accuracy, but such description shall not be conclusive as to the boundaries or extent of the registered land."

Secondly.—The Bill is shorter by some thirty clauses than the Bill of 1874. This abbreviation has been effected, for the most part, by the constantly recurring provision that certain things are to be *prescribed* by general rules to be made by the Lord Chancellor. Among the more important matters so to be dealt with are the following:—How examinations of title are to be conducted (s. 17); forms of mortgages (s. 23); of conveyances and assignments (ss. 30 and 35); transfers of mortgages (s. 41); and the practice as to entry of cautions on the register (s. 61, *et seq.*); mode of appeal to the court; inspection of the register (s. 103); the course of business at the registry (s. 107); scales of costs (s. 112). The practical value and convenience of the system will, therefore, to a very great extent, be determined by the mode in which the details are worked out by the rules.

Thirdly.—We notice with great satisfaction the omission of all compulsory clauses from the present Bill, and with almost equal satisfaction the proposed repeal (s. 132) of s. 7 of "The Vendors and Purchasers Act, 1874." As to the latter, having regard to the differences of opinion among conveyancers of eminence as to its meaning, and the difficulties it has already occasioned in practice, we think it ought to be repealed *ab initio*, as was s. 8 of 7 & 8 Vict. c. 76, by s. 1 of 8 & 9 Vict. c. 106.

Premising that by the Bill now under consideration registration is confined to lands of freehold or leasehold tenure, and that this Bill, like the Bills of 1873 and 1874, contemplates registration of three kinds—viz., (1) of an absolute, (2) of a qualified, or (3) of a possessory title, the Bill proceeds to make a distinct set of provisions for the registration and transfer of freehold and leasehold lands. The Bill of 1873 dismissed the subject of leaseholds in one *mutatis mutandis* clause (s. 44), and although the Bill of 1874 had a few separate clauses, the present distinct set of provisions is far more practical, and will be appreciated in Birmingham, where leasehold interests are so common and valuable. The provisions of s. 11, allowing an attested copy of a lease to be deposited on application for registration only in case the original lease is lost, should be extended to the case where such original lease is properly in the custody of any other person than the applicant. The concluding words, "unless such prohibition against alienation is discharged," are ambiguous, and seem to imply a total abandonment of a restriction on alienation, whereas a licence to register with a restriction under s. 59 would seem to place the lessor and lessee in the same position on the register as they would be before registration.

Conveyances and assignments, or, as the Act calls them, "transfers," of the registered interest are to be made in the prescribed manner, and there is in s. 30 a return to the provision of the Bill of 1873 (s. 82), that there shall be only one, and that the last, land certificate in existence, for every parcel of land on the register. As to mortgages, or, as the Act calls them, "charges," there is an apparent alteration

of the scheme of the Bill of 1874, which we thought an improvement on the Bill of 1873. That scheme provided for legal mortgages—i.e., absolute transfers (s. 58)—not disclosing the equity of redemption on the register, and equitable mortgages either (a) by a deposit of the land certificate (s. 59) or (b) by registered charge (s. 60). The present Bill only provides for "charges" on the register to be made in the prescribed manner (s. 23), which may confer a power of sale, but would seem not to pass to the mortgagee either the present legal estate or its registered equivalent, but may be considered as a substitute for the present legal mortgage. It also permits (s. 82) an equitable mortgage by deposit of the land certificate, which equitable mortgage will be subject to all registered charges. We have called this an *apparent* difference, because it is obvious that without any statutory authority an intending mortgagee can, if he chooses, require to be registered as absolute owner. The clause in the Bill of last year (s. 62), to which we then objected, that a charge should imply a covenant to pay the mortgage debt, which should run with the land, in the absence of anything to the contrary on the register, is repeated in s. 25. The proprietor of a charge is to have powers of entry, foreclosure, and sale (ss. 26–28), in the absence of entries to the contrary on the register.

The most important clauses of the Bill, from a practical point of view, are those in part 3, for the protection of unregistered dispositions, because if registration ever becomes general, the registered proprietor will not be the beneficial owner in a very large number of cases. In all cases in which property is now vested in trustees this must be the case, and inasmuch as no partial interests can be registered, but only the ownership in fee, it is obvious that all life interests and remainders must be dealt with and protected as unregistered dispositions. And as by s. 84 the registrar is forbidden to receive notice of any trust, implied, express, or constructive, the only means of protecting these interests, which must remain unregistered, are (1) restrictions and (2) cautions.

Restrictions (s. 59) can only be placed on the register with the consent of the registered proprietor, and in practice will be found altogether inapplicable to the very frequent case of persons beneficially interested under unregistered dispositions transferring or changing their interests. In many such cases the consent of the registered proprietor (who will be a mere trustee) either cannot be obtained at all, or cannot be obtained without a delay and cost which would be fatal to the object of the transaction.

In all such cases recourse must be had to the protection of a caution under section 54, which provides "that any person interested under any unregistered instrument, or as a judgment creditor, or otherwise howsoever," may lodge a caution. The result of so doing is to entitle the cautioner to notice of any proposed dealings, and by section 55 the registrar is bound, before registering any dealing, to serve a twenty-one days' notice on the cautioner, which, by clause 90, must be sent to his address on the register.

This provision involves two difficulties. The notice will often occasion a serious delay to the person who wishes *bonâ fide* to deal with the land on the register, and, on the other hand, will, at certain periods of the year, be also insufficient notice to the cautioner. The principal objection, however, that we desire to make to these clauses is as to what is to be done when the cautioner appears. He is (s. 56) to come before the court—i.e., the Court of Chancery or the County Court sitting in equity—to enter into a bond, with security, to indemnify "every party against any damage sustained by reason of the dealing with the land being delayed," and then he must proceed to obtain an inhibition under section 53 against the proposed dealing.

We are strongly of opinion that the question of the cautioner's right to interfere with the proposed dealing ought, in the first instance, to be determined by the registrar, and that only in the event of the registrar's decision being adverse to the cautioner should he be required to give security for costs, and embark in a chancery suit. The majority of the questions which will arise on cautions will be of the very simplest description, for having regard to the fact that they must be evidenced by some written instrument, both by the law as it stands and by the express wording of section 54, the question whether the cautioner has a valid claim or not will generally be determined by the mere production of the instrument under which he claims, and only in the case of doubtful questions of construction or priority would a recourse to the court be

necessary. After the large powers which are given to the registrar by section 17, to hear and determine *all objections* to the first registry of title, it can hardly be contended that a registrar who is assumed by the Act itself to be competent for the one duty is not competent (subject of course to appeal) to deal with the other.

By the very necessities of the case recognized and even created by the Act itself, unregistered interests in land protected only by cautions must be freely created, and we foresee great inconvenience and cost, in, as we think, unnecessarily attaching to every caution the penalty of giving security for damages and costs, and engaging in a chancery suit.

Closely connected with this subject there is the important question of the inspection of the register, (section 105, which somewhat differs from the corresponding section 121) of the Bill of 1874). The present provision is "*that subject to such regulations and exceptions, and to the payment of such sums as will be fixed by general rules,*" the following persons and no others may search the register, (1) registered proprietors, (2) persons authorized by them, (3) persons authorized by the court. As the section stands it is more restrictive than the former proposals, except that it may be varied by general orders. Upon this point we still retain the opinion expressed in our report on the Bill of 1874, viz., that an open registry is indispensable, and no advantage will be ultimately gained by restrictions on the search.

The question of costs is (s. 112*) to be also dealt with by general rules, which (sub-section 4) may prescribe "the costs to be charged by solicitors or other agents in or incidental to, or consequential on the registration of land, or any other matter required to be done for the purpose of carrying this Act into execution, with power to require such costs to be payable by commission, per-centage, or otherwise, and to bear a certain proportion to the value of the land registered, or to be determined on such other principle as may be thought expedient."

The words in italics should be omitted. For the proper working of any scheme of registration, it will be at least as important then as it is now that all dealings with the title to land should be conducted by qualified practitioners, immediately responsible to the jurisdiction of the court.

The creation of district registries is in the discretion of the Lord Chancellor with the concurrence of the Treasury. By the withdrawal of the clause making registration compulsory, the arguments adduced in our last report showing the necessity for very numerous district registries have lost much of their force, and it may be prudent to see what use will be made of the principal registry before establishing district registries. We are still of opinion that wherever the measure comes into active operation district registries will be necessary. Solicitors although not eligible for the office of registrar (who must be a barrister) at the principal registry, are together with barristers eligible for the assistant registrarships, and also for district and assistant district registrarships.

We do not encumber this report with many suggestions of detail, which under the Bill as framed must be dealt with by the general rules under section 112. Upon these proposed rules we shall have some suggestions to make on the forms of transfer and mortgage, the necessity of maps, and the scale of costs. If the Bill can be modified in the points we have mentioned, we think it will be a more feasible scheme than any which has preceded it, and the new arrangement of the various clauses and the other improvements which the measure has undergone, render it more deserving of the support of the profession.

At the same time we desire to record our opinion, strengthened by the renewed consideration of the subject, that the really beneficial part of the scheme is the means it affords for the authoritative examination and certification of title. The two essential reforms required appear to us to be (1) such an official examination and certificate as the Bill contemplates, and (2) such an alteration sanctioned by statute, in the present practice of conveyancing as would ensure every title deed being connected with its predecessor and successor, and protecting all *bona fide* purchasers from all instruments not so connected. Such a system would in twenty years ripen the great majority of titles for registration, and would not increase the cost of transfer in the meantime. For the first of these requisites provision is

already made by the Bill, as section 21 gives power to remove land from the register, and thereby close the register as to all subsequent dealings. This is a most valuable provision, and as we observe, with regret, that an attempt is to be made in committee to omit this power, and to re-introduce the compulsory clause, we recommend that every effort should be made against such alteration.

THE BILLS OF SALE AMENDMENT BILL.

THE following report on this Bill has been issued by the committee of the Birmingham Law Society:—The Bill bearing this title recites "that the 17 & 18 Vict. c. 36 (i.e., the Bills of Sale Act, 1854), does not efficiently prevent the mischief which it is intended to prevent, and that it is desirable effectually to prevent that mischief, and other mischiefs of the like character." In its first clause it provides that the words "bill of sale" and "personal chattels" shall have the same meaning as is given to them by section 7 of 17 & 18 Vict. c. 36.

The second clause is directed against the mode of evading the 17 & 18 Vict. c. 36, by successive unregistered bills of sale, which practice was sanctioned, to the surprise of the profession, by the Court of Exchequer Chamber, in *Ramsden v. Lupton* [22 W. R. 129], L. R. 9 Q. B. 17). With this object we heartily agree, but we very much doubt whether it will be effectually accomplished by the provisions of the clause, which, in its endeavour to be very precise, makes the invalidity of the renewed bill of sale to consist in its being given to secure the same debt, money, or money's worth, or any part thereof. It is to be feared that means will be found to vary renewed bills of sale in all the specified particulars, so as to be just without the letter of the clause although violating the spirit of it.

It seems to us that the only effectual remedy is to alter the first clause of 17 & 18 Vict. c. 36, by shortening the limit of twenty-one days allowed for registration to seven days, and providing that as against creditors and trustees in bankruptcy, and, in fact, against everybody but the grantor himself, the bill of sale shall have no operation unless and until registered; so that *unless actual possession be taken* the bill of sale shall take effect from the time of registration only, as against everybody but the grantor. In the case of deeds affecting land, this has always been the rule, and we submit the true principle.

It is submitted that the requirements that the bill of sale should be registered within seven days and before it had any operation against the creditors of the grantor would be as easily complied with, in all *bona fide* transactions, as the present requirement to register within twenty-one days. Registration, even where the parties reside at the extremities of the kingdom, is, as a question of time, a matter of three days only; and if the grantor is in such immediate danger of either an execution or proceedings in bankruptcy that it is dangerous to wait even three days, he ought not to give a bill of sale at all. The enactment we propose would not only prevent the mischief of renewed bills of sale, but also another evasion of the spirit of 17 & 18 Vict. c. 36, not so common but equally pernicious with a renewed bill of sale. We refer to the practice of taking possession by virtue of an unregistered bill of sale, and by collusion between the grantor and grantee, of the goods comprised in the bill of sale just before proceedings for liquidation. Unless the original granting of the bill of sale is void as an act of bankruptcy (which it is not if it is more than six months old) the general creditors have no remedy.

One of the practical difficulties in these cases is to ascertain whether a previous bill of sale has been given. If the section is to remain as drawn, it might be strengthened by requiring an affidavit by the grantor and grantee that no previous unregistered bill of sale relating to the same subject-matter had been executed.

As to the 3rd section, that which we suppose to be its object would, in our opinion, be much better effected by adding the words "mortgage security or charge, legal or equitable," to the definition of a "bill of sale" contained in section 7 of 17 & 18 Vict. c. 36. In attempting to do that by a new enactment, it appears to us the framer of the bill has used words which imply a great deal more, and that, in particular, the introductory words of the section, "whenever any mortgage security or charge on any personal chattels is hereafter effected without a bill of sale, and is of such a

* Now clause 110 [Ed. S. J.].

character that it might have been effected by a bill of sale, it shall be void," are fraught with mischief. Turning to the definition of "personal chattels" in 17 & 18 Vict. c. 36, s. 7, which is expressly included in, and made part of, the Bill under consideration, we find that "fixtures" are included. Now, a mortgage of leasehold property, including fixtures, although not necessary to be registered as a bill of sale (if there be no power to sell the fixtures apart from the land, *Ex parte Barclay* [22 W. R. 608], L. R. 9 Ch. 976), is clearly a mortgage as to the fixtures which might have been effected by means of a bill of sale. If so, the words of this section oblige it to be registered in the new method prescribed by the 4th section of the Bill. If this be not intended, the clause should be altered, and if it be, then it should be clearly understood it is a Bill for the registration of, *inter alia*, all mortgage deeds in which fixtures are included, without any of the safeguards of a proper system of registration, than which nothing more mischievous can be conceived.

To the fourth section we have the further objection that it establishes a new register of a particular kind of bill of sale. If it is desirable to have any particular instrument registered as a bill of sale, let it be so registered, and let all the provisions of the 17 & 18 Vict. c. 36, as to registration attach to it, and we shall know what to register and where to search. But under the clause as it stands, the practitioner will have to consider whether he must register under the 17 & 18 Vict. c. 36, or under the Amendment Act, and a creditor in search of information will have two registers to search instead of one.

THE LAWFULNESS OF "PICKETING."

Mr. Knox, the police magistrate at Marlborough-street, in giving his decision on Thursday week in the case of the men accused of molesting or obstructing Messrs. Jackson & Graham, said the point at issue was of infinite importance to employers and employed throughout the country. Stated in a few words, it was just this—was it or was it not lawful for men on strike persistently to beset, or, as it was called, "picket," the establishment against which they have struck; to accost every applicant for employment in turn, and to inform him that if he held to his purpose his name would be put on the workmen's black list? Had the relaxation of the old laws and the old legal maxims in the matter of combinations gone as far as this? He would simply give the opinions of the judges, and as little of his own as might be. In *Perham's case* the late Chief Baron Pollock said, "It is impossible to doubt that here is evidence of a threat; 'We shall consider you as blacks.'" In *Longman's case* we had such eminent authorities as the late Mr. Justice Wightman and Mr. Justice Blackburn declaring that one O'Neill had brought himself within danger of the law for asking Longman "whether he intended to remain an honourable member and leave Kruger's shop, or stay at his shop, be despised by the club, have his name sent all over the country in the report of the society, and be put to all sorts of unpleasantness." In *Druit's case*, in which he was the committing magistrate, Mr. Baron Bramwell laid it down as undoubted law that if any set of men agreed among themselves to coerce liberty of mind and thought by compulsion and restraint they would be guilty of a criminal offence. So far matters were clear enough—with the exception of one case of which he would speak presently—as far as learned judges sitting singly could make them, though there was no general decision of a Court of Criminal Appeal. But a lawyer would at once reply that since 34 & 35 Vict. all this had been altered. The law as established by that Act, and as applicable to the present purpose, provided that if any person, being a workman, should use violence to any person or property, or threaten or intimidate any person in such manner as would justify a justice of the peace, he must bind over the person so threatening or intimidating to keep the peace. This case had not arisen here, there not having been violence directed against person or property, or threats or intimidation such as would justify the interference of a magistrate in the manner suggested. But there was yet another provision which was the real turning-point of this case. Any workman who beset or watched any place where another person worked or happened to be, or the approach to such house or place, or who, with two or more persons, followed such person in a disorderly manner, with

the object of coercing such person, would be within the meaning of the Act. In the present case there had been no disorderly conduct, no "following" which deserved the name. The point on which the solution of the difficulty must turn, "What is coercion?" now arose. He had repeated what certain learned judges had said prior to the passing of the Act, and he would now refer to what another judge had laid down as law even so far back as 1869. In *Shepherd's case*, to sum the matter up in a few words, there had been a peaceful picketing. The defendants had stopped persons applying for work, but their conduct had been perfectly civil and respectful. This, also, must be noted as most important. There was no evidence of any intimation that the persons stopped would be considered as "black sheep" if they did not desist from their purpose. Mr. Justice Lush said that if the defendants had known the addresses of the men, they might have gone round to persuade them from working, and this would have been perfectly legal. The question in this case was whether they had done any wrong by waiting for them in the street. To bring them within the terms of the Act of 22 Vict. there must have been "threats or molestations," and so on. Be it observed, that Mr. Justice Lush was careful to say that he agreed with the ruling of Mr. Baron Bramwell, and the ruling of the learned baron was clearly that there might be coercion of the liberty of the mind as contradistinguished from threats of personal violence. Had the recent Act 34 & 35 Vict. made any difference in the matter? The learned commissioners who had just reported, *inter alia*, on the working of the Act, expressed their hope that the ruling of Mr. Justice Lush might be followed for the future by all administrators of the law. He was most anxious to do so; but he could not but say that one ingredient was wanting in *Shepherd's case* which was present in this one, namely, the threat or intimation that the workmen dissenting from the views of the pickets would be considered "black sheep." Mr. Baron Bramwell and with him Mr. Justice Lush would seem to agree that this amounted to coercion. Mr. Knox knew not how the matter might affect the minds of other men; he could simply say that in his own case it would have had a great effect on his mind in the direction of coercion if any men having the power of carrying their threat into execution were to tell him that unless he did certain things he would be put under the ban of his profession, be civilly excommunicated, and absolutely ruined. If the thing required of him were not dishonest or illegal, he for one should give way in order to save himself from destruction. This then appeared to amount to coercion and to bring the present defendants within the meaning of the Act. His conclusion was that men had a right to accost intending workmen in the street and peaceably persuade them not to take service. They had a right to combine among themselves against an employer or a fellow-workman and to inform them of their intention; but they had not a right to use terms importing coercion of the will.

Societies.

ARTICLED CLERKS' SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society was held at Clement's-inn Hall on Wednesday last. The secretary announced that the Right Hon. Sir George Jessel, M.R., had kindly consented to become a vice-president of this society. Notice was given that at the next meeting the following resolution would be moved:—"That this society views with surprise and regret the action of the Government in withdrawing the Judicature Act Amendment Bill, and considers that a further postponement of the principal provisions of the Judicature Act, 1873, is not calculated to promote the interests of the public or the profession." Mr. J. S. Rubinstein then opened the subject for the evening's debate—"That the means afforded by the Bankruptcy Act of avoiding the payment in full of just debts are irrational, and should be abolished, a debtor to be capable of obtaining only temporary protection, the operation of the Statute of Limitations to be suspended during the period of protection." The motion was carried by a majority of three after a very animated debate.

Appointments, Etc.

Mr. WILLIAM BARTLETT, solicitor, of Liverpool (Bartlett & Atkinson), has been appointed a Commissioner for taking Affidavits in Chancery, and also a Perpetual Commissioner for taking the Acknowledgments of Married Women.

Mr. CHARLES THEODORE BEWES, solicitor (of the firm of Bewes & Beger), of Stonehouse, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Devonshire (George Soltan Symonds, Esq.) to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the present year.

Mr. MATTHEW FOLLIOTT BLAKISTON, solicitor, of Stafford and Hanley, has been elected Town Clerk of the former place, in the room of Mr. Thomas Brough. Mr. Blakiston was admitted a solicitor in 1858. He is in partnership with Mr. Isaac Edward Everett, and is clerk of the peace and acting under-sheriff for Staffordshire.

Mr. FALKNER SANDES COLLIS, barrister, has been appointed to act as Administrator General of Bengal during the absence of Mr. Lewis Price Delves Broughton. Mr. Collis is a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, and was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Hilary Term, 1863.

Mr. SAMUEL DAY, solicitor (of the firm of Day & Wadger), of St. Neots, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Bedfordshire (Lieut. Col. William Stuart) to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the present year.

Mr. CHARLES M. ELBOROUGH, solicitor, of 17, King's Arms-yard, Moorgate-street, has been appointed a London Commissioner for taking Affidavits in the Court of Exchequer.

Mr. BRUTON JOHN FORD, solicitor, of Exeter, has been appointed Acting Under-Sheriff of Devonshire for the present year.

Mr. JOHN POPE HENNESSY, barrister, now Governor of the Bahamas, has been appointed Governor of the Windward Islands, in succession to Mr. Rawson William Rawson, C.B., whose term of office has expired. Mr. Hennesy is the son of the late Mr. John Hennesy, of Ballymacmoy, King's County, and was born in 1834. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Michaelmas Term, 1861, and joined the Home Circuit. From 1859 to 1865 he was M.P. for King's County in the Conservative interest. In 1867 he was appointed Governor of Labuan, and in 1871 he was transferred to the governorship of the Bahamas. In 1872 he acted as Administrator-General of the West African Settlements, on the transfer of the Protectorate of the Gold Coast from the Dutch.

Mr. JOHN KYNASTON, solicitor (of the firm of Kynaston & Gasquet), 88, Queen-street, Cheapside, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for taking Acknowledgments of Deeds by Married Women for the County of Middlesex and the Cities of London and Westminster.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER LETHBRIDGE, solicitor (of the firm of Lethbridge & Son), 25, Abingdon-street, Westminster, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for taking the Acknowledgments of Deeds by Married Women for the County of Middlesex and the Cities of London and Westminster.

Mr. JOSEPH PHILLIPS, solicitor (of the firm of Thompson, Phillips, & Evans), of Stamford, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Northamptonshire (Col. Thomas Tyron) to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the present year.

Mr. ASHER PRIOR, solicitor, of Colchester, has been appointed a Commissioner for taking Affidavits in the Court of Exchequer.

Mr. CHARLES ROBBINS, of the firm of Messrs. Bolton, Robbins, & Busk, of 1, New-square, Lincoln's-inn, has been appointed a London Commissioner to administer Oaths in Common Law in the Court of Common Pleas.

Mr. FRANCIS SANDERS, solicitor, of Birmingham and Dudley, has been appointed Registrar of the Wolverhampton County Court (Circuit No. 25), in succession to the late Mr. Charles Gallimore Brown.

Mr. EDMUND SUMNER, solicitor (of the firm of Fielder & Sumner), 14, Godliman-street, has been appointed a London Commissioner for taking Affidavits in Chancery.

Mr. JOHN ARTHUR TALBOT, solicitor, of Newtown, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Montgomeryshire (Richard Edward Jones, Esq.) to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the present year.

Mr. EDWARD WAUGH, solicitor, of Cockermonth, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Cumberland (John Porter Foster, Esq.) to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the present year.

Mr. THOMAS BURNETT WOODHAM, solicitor, of Winchester, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Hampshire (William Howley Kingsmill, Esq.) to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the present year.

Mr. Alfred Hopkinson, B.A., Fellow of University College, has been elected to the Vinerian Law Scholarship at Oxford.

Mr. William Watson, the Solicitor-General for Scotland, has received the degree of LL.D. from the University of Edinburgh.

The Town Council of Manchester have raised the salary of Sir Joseph Heron, the town clerk of that city, from £2,000 to £2,500 per annum.

Sir John George Shaw Lefevre, K.C.B., has resigned the office of clerk of the Parliaments on account of ill health, after twenty-seven years' service in the office of the House of Lords. He is the younger brother of Viscount Eversley, and was born in 1797. He was Senior Wrangler in 1818, and was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in 1825, and practised for some time as a conveyancer. He was successively Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, a Poor Law Commissioner, a Civil Service Commissioner, and Assistant Secretary to the Board of Trade. Earl Granville stated in the House of Lords last Monday that Sir J. Lefevre had served on no less than sixteen unpaid commissions; and he has also been an ecclesiastical commissioner and Vice-Chancellor of the University of London.

Parliament and Legislation.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

MARCH 8.—JUDICATURE ACT AMENDMENT

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said that the Government had found that from among those who ordinarily were supporters of the Government they must prepare, not only not to receive support for this Bill, but to encounter a very general opposition. Even on the other side of the House opinion was divided. Under those circumstances the Government had been obliged to admit that it would be impossible to pass the Bill through that House. They had no course to pursue, therefore, but to withdraw the Bill.—Lord SELBORNE said that the circumstances under which the Bill had been abandoned were not a little extraordinary. The legislation to which the Bill was to give effect was preceded by a series of inquiries and also by tentative measures for improving the appellate jurisdiction of that House; all of those suggested measures had proved failures. It had been said that the country was not satisfied with what had been done in 1873—that the transfer had never been recommended by any committee or commission, and that it had been voted by the two Houses of Parliament without full consideration; but those arguments had been disposed of in 1873, and were met again last year, when that House again affirmed and gave further effect to the Act of 1873. Considering that legislation was adopted only two years ago, and that it had never been tried in actual operation, to intercept it in the manner now announced without any warning or anything else to prepare Parliament and the country for such a proceeding, did seem to him not a little extraordinary. He read in the papers that there had been organized what was called "The House of Lords' Committee," which in-

assisted on their lordships retaining powers and duties which they gave up two years ago because they felt that they had not sufficient means of discharging the duties annexed to them. If such an outside organization was to be successful on a question relating to the powers and prerogatives of that House, to what lengths might not such a mode of interference be carried in other matters? It would also appear that while this Bill was yet before that House, after it had passed through committee, but while it was waiting the next stage, a member of the other House had given notice of a resolution having for its object to obtain the opinion of that House on a most important feature in the Bill still before their lordships' House. He hoped that was the only instance in our parliamentary history of such a proceeding as that.—The Duke of RICHMOND thought it was impossible for a Government to force through a measure of that kind contrary to the wishes and feelings of the House. No one would regret more than he did the course the Government had felt obliged to adopt in respect of the Bill; but seeing the opposition that there was to the Bill, they had arrived at the conclusion that it would be useless to attempt to force it through an unwilling House.—Earl GLENELG thought that, looking at the past history of the Bill, at the deliberate assent it received from that House, and at its great importance, such a measure having been introduced by the Government ought not to be disposed of by secret communications and without discussion in Parliament.—The Earl of DERBY said the Government came to the decision just announced with feelings of the deepest disappointment. He said for himself distinctly that under no circumstances would he have yielded if he had not felt that he was yielding to a pressure of imperative necessity.—Earl GRANVILLE asked whether we were to have any further enactment this year; whether the Government intended to propose any amendments of the Act now on the Statute-book: or whether that measure, which transferred English appeals from that House, was, so far as the Government were concerned, to come in force next November.—The LORD CHANCELLOR stated that the present Bill would be withdrawn. Whether some legislation would not be necessary in respect of the Act of 1873 was a matter which would require consideration. He should announce the intention of the Government on that matter at the earliest favourable date.—The Bill was then withdrawn.

POLICE MAGISTRATES' (METROPOLIS) SALARIES.

This Bill was read a second time.

REGISTRY OF DEEDS OFFICE (IRELAND).

This Bill was read a second time.

MARCH 9.—INCREASE OF THE EPISCOPATE.

On the motion for going into committee on this Bill, Lord HOUGHTON moved as an amendment that the Bill be referred to a select committee.—The amendment was negatived.—The House then went into committee on the Bill. The clauses were agreed to with the addition of a clause proposed by the Bishop of EXETER, to the effect that it should be lawful for the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, in any scheme for the formation of a new bishopric, to attach to that bishopric a portion of the income of any other which might be thereby diminished.

POLICE MAGISTRATES' (METROPOLIS) SALARIES.

This Bill passed through committee.

REGISTRY OF DEEDS OFFICE (IRELAND).

This Bill passed through committee.

MARCH 11.—PATENTS.

Their lordships went into committee on this Bill, and the clauses up to 5 inclusive were agreed to.—On clause 6, the LORD CHANCELLOR said that as the Bill stood, it was proposed that the examiners, who were to make reports to the law officers, should not be more than four nor less than two in number, and it was intended that each application for a patent should be examined by one examiner and one or two referees. He would move amendments in clause 6 and other clauses having for their object to effect this alteration—that there should be two, and not more than six examiners, that the panel of referees should be made by the Commissioners of Patents without the concurrence of the Board of Trade

and that the association of a referee with an examiner should not be obligatory, but permissive. It was in consequence of this last alteration that it was thought advisable to provide that as many as six examiners—instead of four, the number at present in the Bill—might be appointed.—The Duke of SOMERSET asked who would be responsible for giving a patent after this Bill passed? Would it be the Commissioners of Patents or the law officers?—The LORD CHANCELLOR said that beyond doubt the law officers would be so responsible, subject to an appeal to the Lord Chancellor or a judge of the High Court designated for the hearing of such appeals.—The amendments proposed by the LORD CHANCELLOR were then agreed to, as was also the clause itself when so amended. Clauses up to 47 inclusive were also agreed to after other amendments proposed by the LORD CHANCELLOR. On clause 48, the Marquis of LANSDOWNE moved, as an amendment, to omit from the clause these words:—"For establishing, subject to the approval of the Treasury, and open to public inspection, a museum or collection of models of inventions and other objects relating to patents and inventions."—After some discussion the amendment was withdrawn, clause 48 and the remaining portions of the Bill were agreed to, and the Bill passed through committee.

APPEALS TO THE LORDS.

On the motion of Lord SELBORNE, returns were ordered of all appeals from the Lord Chancellor, or from the Court of Appeal in Chancery in England, which were heard or decided by the House, and in which the costs were taxed by the proper officer of the House, during the years 1871-72-73-74, and of the amount of the taxed costs of all such appeals, as well as the taxed costs of the hearing or re-hearing.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MARCH 5.—THE COURT OF APPEAL.

Mr. WALPOLE gave notice that on an early day he would call attention to the defective state of the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873, with reference to the constitution of her Majesty's Court of Appeal, and move the following resolution:—" (1) That it is desirable in any re-arrangement of the Judicature of the United Kingdom to make provision that the ultimate appeal should be made in all cases to the same tribunal; and (2) that it is expedient that appeals from the courts of Great Britain and Ireland should be carried as heretofore to the House of Lords."

BILL READ A FIRST TIME.

Colonel BRERSTORD brought in a Bill for improving the supply of water to the metropolis.

MARCH 8.—WELSH COUNTY COURTS.

On the motion for going into committee of supply, Mr. M. LLOYD moved for a select committee to inquire into the administration of justice in those portions of the Principality of Wales where the Welsh language prevails, and to consider the expediency of appointing official interpreters to attend the courts there.—The motion was seconded by Sir E. WILMOT.—Mr. CROSS said he had asked the opinions of the county court judges on the subject, and, out of five, only one gave the proposal any encouragement, while the others were strongly against the proposal. Unless a much stronger case could be made out than the House had just heard, he must resist the appointment of a select committee.—The motion was withdrawn.

INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHT.

This Bill was read a second time.

BOSTON ELECTION.

On the motion of the ATTORNEY-GENERAL, it was ordered that an humble address should be presented to her Majesty praying for the appointment of a commission, consisting of Mr. McIntyre, Q.C., Mr. Wyndham Slade, and Mr. Douglas Straight, for the purpose of making inquiry into the existence of the corrupt practices reported to prevail in the borough of Boston at the last election.

APPELLATE JURISDICTION.

Mr. GREGORY gave notice that he would move to amend the motion of which Mr. Walpole had given notice, by inserting words to provide for the continuous sitting of the

House of Lords as a Court of Ultimate Appeal, with the attendance of not less than three judges.

MARCH 9.—CORRUPT PRACTICES AT PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved "That a select committee be appointed to inquire into the operation of 'The Corrupt Practices Prevention Act, 1854,' 'The Parliamentary Election Act, 1868,' and 'The Corrupt Practices Commissioners' Expenses Act, 1869,' and the several Acts by which the same have been respectively continued and amended, and to report whether any, and what, further measures are necessary for the prevention of corrupt practices at parliamentary elections."—Mr. C. E. LEWIS moved as an amendment to add to the end of the Attorney-General's motion the words: "And what, if any, improvements may be made in the law relating to the trial of election petitions."—The ATTORNEY-GENERAL assured the hon. member that he had no intention of limiting the proposed inquiry in any way, and agreed to leave out the concluding words of his motion, namely, "whether any, and what, further measures are necessary for the prevention of corrupt practices at parliamentary elections," substituting for them the word "thereon."—The amendment was then withdrawn, and the motion as amended was agreed to.

FOREIGN LOANS REGISTRATION.

This Bill was read a second time and referred to the Select Committee on Foreign Loans.

EAST INDIA HOME GOVERNMENT (PENSIONS).

This Bill was read a second time.

PUBLIC WORSHIP FACILITIES.

This Bill was referred to a select committee.

SUPERANNUATION ACT (1859) AMENDMENT.

This Bill was read a third time and passed.

MARCH 10.—AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS' DWELLINGS (IRELAND).

Mr. CAVANAGH moved the second reading of this Bill, but after some conversation the debate was adjourned.

MATRIMONIAL CAUSES AND MARRIAGE LAW (IRELAND).

This Bill was read a second time.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME.

Captain PIM brought in a Bill to provide for the organization of a Mercantile Marine Hospital Service and the medical examination of merchant seamen.

MARCH 11.—JUDICATURE ACT.

Mr. WALPOLE, in reply to Mr. O. MORGAN, said he should not now press forward his motion, but should reserve to himself the fullest power of bringing it on at any future period in case he found it advisable to do so.

EPFING FOREST.

This Bill passed through committee.

Legal Items.

The following are stated to be the alterations intended to be made in the county court circuits, consequent on the appointment of two judges to the Leeds circuit. Circuit No. 12 (Halifax): Todmorden will be substituted for Pontefract. Circuit No. 14 (Leeds): Pontefract will be added. Circuit No. 11 (Bradford): Clitheroe will be transferred to Circuit No. 4. Circuit No. 4 (Preston): Bacup will be transferred to Circuit No. 5 (Bolton). We believe, however, that the alterations are not yet finally settled.

Mr. Justice Huddleston has taken the place of the Lord Chief Baron on the Western Circuit.

Lord Coleridge was summoned from circuit on Tuesday by a telegram of an alarming character with respect to the state of health of his father, Sir John Coleridge.

In a very recent case, says the *Central Law Journal*, Chief Justice Chapman observed that "Experience is not sufficiently uniform to raise a presumption that one who has the

means of paying a debt will actually pay it." *Atwood v. Scott* (99 Mass. 178).

In a recent volume of "Reports of Cases Argued and Determined in the Court of Appeals of the State of New York," is this marginal note, and this only: "Judgment affirmed of course." *Lyman v. Wilber* (3 Kays, 427).

A law recently enacted in Russia left it doubtful whether in criminal cases the right of choosing a defender was to be subject to restriction. It is stated that the Senate has decided that the new law leaves this right entirely free.

The payments from the Civil Contingencies Fund in the current financial year include a sum of £3,000, which is a further payment to the Corporation of London for a substitute during the Recorder's absence in America on the Mixed Claims Commission.

In a trial at the assizes at Limerick on Saturday, after deliberating for an hour, the jury returned a verdict of "Not guilty." Mr. Justice Lawson asked if it was possible they had found such a verdict after hearing the evidence, and the foreman replied that they had done their best. The learned judge is stated to have observed that in the whole course of his experience he never witnessed a more wilful and distinct violation of an oath. It was beyond anything he could have imagined or believed. He was using strong language, but in the discharge of his duty as a judge he felt bound to use it.

The *Albany Law Journal*, apropos of a recent conviction for killing a cat, cites *Brill v. Flagler* (23 Wend. 354) where Judge Nelson laid it down as the law, that the inhabitant of a dwelling-house may lawfully kill the dog of another, where such dog is in the habit of haunting his house, and by bark and howling, by day and by night, disturbing the peace and quiet of his family, if the dog cannot otherwise be prevented from annoying him. "The distinguished judge whom we have quoted," adds the journal, "had some sympathy for human nature; said he, 'It would be a mockery to refer a party to his remedy by action; it is far too dilatory and impotent for the exigency of the case.'"

The *Bradford Observer* states that on Tuesday last a deputation was introduced to Mr. W. T. S. Daniel, Q.C., judge of the Bradford County Court, in his honour's private room, by Alderman Terry, one of the advocates practising in the court. The deputation consisted of the mayor, Alderman M. W. Thompson, and the town clerk (Mr. McGowen). A conversation took place relative to the rumoured transfer of his honour to the Leeds Circuit, and a strong wish was expressed by the local gentlemen that his honour would continue to preside over the county court of Bradford. Mr. Daniel subsequently made some remarks in court in which he intimated that whatever was the result of the change he should not forsake Bradford.

It is stated that there is a pauper debtor, named Kelly, in the county gaol of Roscommon, whose incarceration dates from the 23rd of June, 1853. This man costs the country £53 a year for his support, and very shortly he will have completed twenty-two years' confinement. At the late assizes the matter was brought before the grand jury, and a representation was made of the fact to Mr. Justice O'Brien, who asked for the production of the warrant under which this person was detained. The governor of the gaol informed his lordship that he believed the man was imprisoned for contempt of court for non-payment of costs in the Court of Probate. As the order of that court, which was asked for, could not be produced, his lordship requested the Crown Solicitor to inquire into the matter.

A New York correspondent of the *Boston Journal* states, that "a company has been formed to do for the law what the telegraph does for brokers and bankers. A machine is to be put into every law office in the city, and everything transpiring in the courts is to be transmitted, as the sale of stocks is sent to all the hotels and financial institutions of the city. A lawyer will not have to run to court to know what cases are on trial, what judgments are rendered, or what legal transaction takes place in the courts. A bureau is to be established in the court-house, and every department of jurisprudence is to be represented therein. Everything transacted will go over the wires as stocks now do. The arrangement will include all that is done in the sheriff's office; every judgment and levy; every mort-

age and attachment; every case tried, from the justices' court up to the supreme; with every verdict and every disagreement. The putting up of the instrument is to cost about 250 dols. each. If the plan is carried out, it will make an entire revolution in the office practice of law in the city."

Court Papers.

COURT OF CHANCERY.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	LORD CHANCELLOR.	MASTER OF THE ROLLS.	LORDS JUSTICES.
Monday, Mar. 15	Mr. Disraeli	Mr. Farrer	Mr. Pemberton
Tuesday	16 King	Rogers	Ward
Wednesday ..	17 Disraeli	Farrer	Pemberton
Thursday	18 King	Rogers	Ward
Friday	19 Disraeli	Farrer	Pemberton
Saturday	20 King	Rogers	Ward

	V. C. MALINS.	V. C. BACON.	V. C. HALL.
Monday, Mar. 15	Mr. Latham	Mr. Milne	Mr. Teesdale
Tuesday	16 Leach	Merivale	Holdship
Wednesday ..	17 Latham	Milne	Teesdale
Thursday	18 Leach	Merivale	Holdship
Friday	19 Latham	Milne	Teesdale
Saturday	20 Leach	Merivale	Holdship

CERTIFICATES OF SALE AND TRANSFER.

Mond., Mar. 15	Mr. King	Thurs. Mar. 18	Mr. Pemberton
Tuesday .. 16	Farrer	Friday	Leach
Wednesday 17	Holdship	Saturday ..20	Milne

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

LAST QUOTATION, Mar. 12, 1875.

3 per Cent. Consols, 92½	Annuities, April, '85, 9½
4½ per Cent. Account, April 92½	Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1909
3 per Cent. Reduced, 91½ x d	Ex Billa, £1000, 2½ per Ct. 1 pm.
New 5 per Cent., 91½ x d	Ditto, £500, Do 1 pm.
Do. 4½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Ditto, £100 & £200, 1 pm.
Do. 4½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Bank of England Stock, 5 per
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '73	Ct. (last half-year),
Annuities, Jan. '80 —	Ditto for Account.

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '89, 108½	Ditto 5½ per Cent., May, '79 101½
Ditto for Account, —	Ditto Debentures, 4 per Cent,
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '88, 103½ x d	April, '64
Ditto, ditto, Certificates —	Do. Do. 5 per Cent., Aug. '73
Ditto Exchanged Ppr., 4 per Cent. 94	Do. Bonds, 4 per Cent. £1000
Ind. Inf. Pr., 5 p Ct., Jan. '73	Ditto, ditto, under £1000

RAILWAY STOCK.

Railways.	Paid.	Closing Price.
Stock Bristol and Exeter	100	113
Stock Caledonian	100	107½
Stock Glasgow and South-Western	100	98
Stock Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	44½
Stock Great Northern	100	137
Stock Do., A Stock	100	132
Stock Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	107
Stock Great Western—Original	100	108½ x d
Stock Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	139
Stock London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	98½
Stock London, Chatham, and Dover	100	94½
Stock London and North-Western	100	144½
Stock London and South-Western	100	113½
Stock Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	79½
Stock Metropolitan	100	85
Stock Midland	100	35½
Stock North British	100	130½
Stock North Eastern	100	74
Stock North London	100	163½
Stock North Staffordshire	100	113
Stock South Devon	100	69
Stock South-Eastern	100	56
Stock South-Eastern	100	117

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

No change was made on Thursday in the Bank rate. The proportion of reserve to liabilities has fallen from 39½ per cent. last week to 39 per cent. this week. Prices in the home railway market have been generally firm, but on Thursday there was considerable fluctuation. The foreign market was steady up to Tuesday, when there was a relapse, but on Wednesday and Thursday the tone was firm. Consols closed on Thursday 92½ to ¼ for money, and 93 to ¼ for the account.

The twenty-sixth annual report of the Prudential Assurance Company states that during the year ending December 31, 3,539 proposals in the ordinary branch for the sum of £494,215 had been received; 2,757 had been accepted, assuring the sum of £375,000, producing a new annual premium income of £12,193; that in the industrial branch 888,758 new policies had been issued, representing a new annual premium income of £332,049; and that the total premium income is £687,488, being an increase of £149,777 over the year 1873.

BIRTHS AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

ADCOCK—March 2, at Prior's Wood, near Wigan, Lancashire, the wife of Frank Adcock, solicitor, of a son.
GIBSON—March 4, at Berkeley-lodge, Shoot-up-hill, Cricklewood, the wife of Jasper Gibson, of 64, Lincoln's-inn-fields, of a son.
THOMPSON—March 9, at 136, Ladbroke-grove-road north, Kensington, W., the wife of J. Eyre Thompson, barrister-at-law, of a son.
WALLROTH—March 7, at Sunbury, the wife of F. A. Wallroth, barrister-at-law, of a son.

DEATHS.

BUCKLEY—March 9, at Limehurst, Ashton-under-Lyne, William Buckley, solicitor, aged 63.
FLATHER—March 8, at 37, Burton-crescent, St. Pancras, John Flather, M.A., of Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law, aged 88.
JACKAMAN—March 6, at Ipswich, Simon Batley Jackaman, aged 74.
LAURIE—Feb. 23, at Boulogne-sur-Mer, France, George Laurie, solicitor, aged 70.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, March 6, 1875.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Britannia Engineering Company, Leeds, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Hall, dated Feb 25, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Learoyd & Co, Chancery lane, solicitors for the petitioner.
Grovesend Steam Coal Colliery Company, Limited.—By an order made by the M.R., dated Feb 25, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Shakespear, Duke st, Bloomsbury, agent for Layson, Neath, solicitor for the petitioner.

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

Main Printing, Stationery, and Paper Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented March 1, directed to be heard before the V.C. at 6, Stone buildings, Lincoln's inn, on Tuesday, March 16. Leigh, Manchester, solicitor for the petitioner.

STANNARIES OF CORNWALL.

Great Work Consols Mining Company.—By an order made by the Vice-Warden of the Stannaries, dated March 1, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Hodge and Co, Truro, petitioners' solicitors.

TUESDAY, March 9, 1875.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Mutual Society Trust Fund.—By an order made by V.C. Malins, dated Feb 25, it was ordered that the above fund be wound up. Müller, King st, Cheapside, solicitor for the petitioners.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Cwm Bychan Silver Lead Mining Company, Limited.—By an order made by the M.R., dated Feb 27, it was ordered that the above company be wound up, and his honour thereby appointed Thomas Stephen Evans, 6, Bucklersbury, provisionally official liquidator.
Kerly, Great Winchester st, solicitor for the petitioners.
Common Road Conveyance Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Hall, dated Feb 26, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Tocque, Aldermanbury, solicitor for the petitioners.
E. Broutant and Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented March 3, directed to be heard before the M.R. on March 20. Greatorex, Chancery lane, solicitor for the petitioner.

Englefield Colliery Company, Limited.—V.C. Malins has, by an order dated Feb 12, appointed James Thomas Snell, 88, Chapside, to be the official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before March 31, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims to the above. Thursday, April 8, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Metropolitan Counties Co-operative Coal Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented March 5, directed to be heard before the M.R. on March 23. Linklater and Co, Walbrook, solicitors for the petitioner.

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

FRIDAY, March 5, 1875.

Bucks and Middlesex District Widow and Orphan Friendly Society, North Star Tavern, Slough, Bucks. March 3.
Lambeth Mutual Provident Society, Vestry Hall, Kennington green, Surrey. Feb 16.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, March 5, 1875.

Aracan, vessel, and ship American. June 26. Union Steamship Company, Limited, v Brocklebank, M.R.
Chambers, John, Belmont, York, Ironmaster. April 2. Chambers v Chambers, M.R. Smith, Sheffield.
Falkner, Robert, Manchester, Merchant. April 15. Falkner v Scott, V.C. Malins. Grundy, Manchester.
Foley, Henry Samuel, Victoria, Australia, Esq. March 30. Wheatly v Davies, V.C. Malins. Abbott, Mcklenburgh square.
Kathleen, vessel, and ship Mallowdale. March 31. Hunter v Chipman, V.C. Malins.
Smith, John. Caroline place, Middle row, Kinsal new town, Gent. April 10. Sturdy v Bradford, V.C. Hall. Paterson and Co, Bouverie st, Fleet st.

TUESDAY, March 9, 1875.

Best, Henry Waddelow, Thetford, Norfolk, Surgeon. April 15. Best v Mines, V.C. Malins. Merriman, Austin Friars.
Canadian Oil Works Corporation, Limited. May 1. Taylor v The Canadian Oil Works Corporation, Limited, V.C. Malins.
Congreve, Mary Ann, Burton, Cheshire. April 1. Barker v Congreve, V.C. Hall. Barker and Hignett, Chester.
Griffiths, Ann, Llanasa, Flint. April 6. Sison v Jones, M.R. Whitehouse, Lincoln's inn fields.
Hall, William Robert, Speenhamland, Berks, Gent. April 10. Turnbull v Pinniker, V.C. Malins.
Hanne, Thomas Arundell, Buckland Newton, Dorset, Gent. March 31. Hanne v Watts, V.C. Malins. Burgess, Lincoln's inn fields.
Latch, Joseph, Newport, Monmouth, Merchant. April 7. Latch v Latch, V.C. Hall. Llewellyn, Newport.
Other, Edward, Kirkbridge, York, Gent. April 5. Other v Other, M.R. Teale and Son, Leyburn.
Salter, William, East Dereham, Norfolk. April 8. V.C. Malins.
Worthington, Elizabeth, Cowley, Middlesex. April 6. Worthington v James, M.R. Deane, South square, Gray's inn.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

TUESDAY, March 2, 1875.

Abbott, Daniel, Liverpool rd, Clerkenwell, Butcher. April 2. Smith, King William st.
Ashworth, John, Rochdale, Lancashire, Gent. April 1. Roberts and Son, Rochdale.
Aldart, Alfred John, Southampton, Coach Builder. May 3. Deacon, Southampton.
Bignold, Sir Samuel, Norwich, Kent. May 25. Fox, Norwich.
Colbeck, William Coxon, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Draper. June 1. Joel, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Cragg, Phebe, Exeter. April 1. Daw and Son, Exeter.
Derling, Edward C Holmesley, Jermyn st, Esq. April 5. Rooper, Lincoln's inn fields.
Fleming, James, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Baker. Joel, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Furniss, Jane, Sheffield. March 31. Clegg, Sheffield.
Gibbs, Sarah, Leeds. April 17. Balmer and Son, Leeds.
Glenay, Francis, Chadwell heath, Essex, Farmer. April 12. Hilliards, Fenchurch buildings, Fenchurch st.
Harper, Charles, Valista, Malta, Retired Magistrate. May 24. Howitt and Alexander, Ely place, Highborn.
Hemingway, Henry, Collingwood Stockale, Melbourn, Victoria, Painter. Oct 1. Resident in the United Kingdom, Langham and Son, Bartlett's buildings, Highborn; resident out of the United Kingdom, Trollope and Wilmott, Melbourne, Victoria.
Higgins, Dinah, Birmingham. April 12. Whateley and Co, Birmingham.
Holland, Edward, Dumbleton, Gloucester, Esq. April 10. Maynard and Son, Coleman st.
Ireland, Hannah, Wem, Salop. April 8. Lucas, Wem.
Jones, John, Welshpool, Montgomery, Parish Clerk. April 24. Jones, Welshpool.
Jones, Michael Herman, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Tobaccoist. June 1. Joel, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Lee, Barrett, Cheltenham, Gloucester. April 6. Ticehurst and Sons, Cheltenham.
Leslie, Anthony, Alfred place, Brompton, Esq. June 24. Arnold and Co, Carey st, Lincoln's inn.
Lillywhite, John, Euston square, Cricketing Outfitter. April 5. Senior and Co, New inn, Strand.
Lloyd, Richard, Birmingham, Ironmonger. April 12. Whateley and Co, Birmingham.
Massey, Samuel, Basford, Nottingham, Joiner. April 10. Martin, Nottingham.
Owen, Rev John, Loughborough park, Brixton. May 1. Fraser, Farniva's inn.
Pearson, John, Sheffield, Coal Dealer. March 31. Clegg and Sons, Sheffield.

Platt, Rev Ralph, Dodding green, Kendal, Westmorland. May 1.
Arnold and Co, Carey st, Lincoln's inn.
Povey, Thomas, Southport, Lancashire, Gent. March 25. Tompkins, Barlham.
Preston, Thomas, Manchester, Pawnbroker. May 1. Heywood, Manchester.
Read, Stephen, Thornford, Dorset, Yeoman. May 3. Malmouth and Bartlett, Sherborne.
Rixon, William, Eastbourne, Sussex, Solicitor. April 15. Rivington and Son, Fenchurch buildings.
Simpson, Anthony, Kingston-upon-Hull, Master Mariner. April 12. Walker and Spink, Hull.
Smith, Benjamin, Leaden Roothing, Essex, Farmer. April 14. Taylor, Bishop's Stortford.
Taylor, Robert, Croxton, Cambridge, Yeoman. March 29. Wilkinson and Co, St Neots.
Travis, James, Oldham, Lancashire, Cotton Spinner. April 1. Murray and Wrigley, Oldham.
Vaughan, Anne, Crickhowell, Brecon. March 30. Lewis, Crickhowell.
Watson, Anthony, Jarrow, Durham, Gent. June 1. Joel, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Weller, Edward, Swiss Villa, Turnham green, Esq. March 30. Woodbridge and Son, Uxbridge.
Whinall, Charles, Southport, Lancashire, Merchant. March 23. Richardson and Co, Liverpool.

FRIDAY, March 5, 1875.

Acklam, Ann, Beverley, York. April 6. Shepherd and Co, Beverley.
Adams, William Whitehall, Ashford, Middlesex, Farmer. March 25. John Plover Smith, Hampton Wick.
Aubrey, Charlotte Scrymshar, Richmond, Surrey. April 30. Cox, St Swithin's lane.
Barker, Charles, Edgware rd. May 5. Bicknell and Hortin, Edgware rd.
Beck, Richard Thomas, Combs, Suffolk, Esq. April 16. Marriott and Son, Stowmarket.
Beckwith, Catharine Rance, Clifton Hall Asylum, near Manchester. April 24. Sharp, Lynton.
Bent, John, Birmingham, Gas Meter Manufacturer. April 1. Ryland and Co, Birmingham.
Bent, Francis, Birmingham. April 1. Ryland and Co, Birmingham.
Benton, George, Metropolitan Meat Market, West Smithfield. April 10. Hubbard, London Joint Stock Bank chambers, West Smithfield.
Boyce, John, Bow st, Covent garden, Licensed Victualler. May 17. Sweetstone, York st west, Commercial rd east.
Brown, Emily, Eton, Buckingham. May 31. Phillips, Windsor.
Bryan, John, Liverpool, Engineer. March 31. Goffey, Liverpool.
Chapman, Caroline Sarah, Tanbridge Wells, Kent. April 12. Park and Co, Essex st, Strand.
Churley, William, Edgbaston, Birmingham, Accountant. April 3. Foster, Birmingham.
Cooper, Ann, Leamington Priors, Warwickshire. May 10. Field, Leamington Priors.
Eldridge, John, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Esq. May 1. Palmer, Cheltenham.
Foster, Thomas, Middleton, York, Yeoman. April 1. Watson and Whitehead, Pickering.
Fauche, Marie Anne Ernestine, Neufchâteau, France. March 18. Bolton, Elm court, Temple.
Fell, George, Walton st, Chelsea, Gent. April 14. Child, Paul's Bakehouse court, Doctors' commons.
Foley, Hannah Louisa, Llanasa, Carmarthen. April 15. Wheatley, New inn, Strand.
Green, William, Ryde, Isle of Wight, Esq. May 1. Hollingsworth and Co, East India avenue.
Greene, John Stock Turner, Southworth House, near Wigan, Lancashire, Esq. May 31. Holden and Holden, Bolton.
Hamilton, Rev George, Lavender terrace, Lavender hill. March 31. Baker and Co, Cloak lane, Cannon st.
Hodges, Suzana, Brynaston st, Marylebone. April 20. Garrard and Co, Suffolk st, Pall mall east.
Hunt Edward, Freemantle, Southampton, Gent. April 10. Robins, Southampton.
Inderwick, George, Princes st, Leicester square, Merchant. April 20. Garrard and Co, Suffolk st, Pall mall east.
James, Thomas, Pant Farm, Llangatwg, Lingoed, Monmouth, Farmer. March 23. Walford and Gabb, Abercromby.
Kingley, Rev Charles, Everley Rectory, Hants. May 1. Crowley and Son, Serjeants' inn, Fleet st.
Kirley, Ann, Darby. April 12. Beale and Co, Great George st, Westminster.
Low, Ann Rist, Gray's inn rd. April 14. Wilkins, King's Arms yard.
Maine, Charles, Southampton, Master of Workhouse. April 15. Pearce, Great Winchester st.
Marshall, Richard, Hornsea, Yorkshire, Esq. May 1. Holden and Co, Hull.
Matthews, Thomas, Hucclecote, Gloucester, Farmer. April 10. Wiltons and Rufford, Gloucester.
Midd, William Henry, Stockport, Cheshire, Surgeon. April 5. Vaughan, Cheshire.
Nutter, Phoebe, Leamington Priors, Warwickshire. May 10. Field, Leamington Priors.
Parry, Robert, Chippingham rd, Harrow rd, Commander R.N., and Parry, Eliza, Kingston-on-Thames, Surrey. April 20. Garrard and Co, Suffolk st, Pall Mall east.
Pierce, Hugh, Rhyl, Flintshire, Draper. April 11. Williams, Rhyl.
Pigott, Ann Maria, Montague court, Little Britain. March 30. Turner, Jacob's Well mews, Manchester square.
Rowe, Samuel Brooking, Cornhill, Stationer. March 31. Baker and Co, Cloak lane, Cannon st.
Seaborn, Sarah, Upper Howsell, Leigh, Worcester. April 5. Knott, Worcester.
Speller, William, Great Easton, Essex, Farmer. April 7. Snell, Great Dunmow.
Stanes, Reuben, Provost st, Hoxton, Eating House Keeper. March 31. Mills and Lockyer, Brunswick place, City rd.
Storey, Joseph, Waltham green, Gent. March 31. Dobree, Lincoln's inn fields.

Taylor, Edley, Ecclesfield, York, Fire Brick Manufacturer. April 15.
Wake, Sheffield
Walker, Margaret, Sheffield. April 1. Rodgers and Co, Sheffield
Williams, Thomas, Rhyll, Flintshire, Draper. April 14. Williams, Rhyll
Willis, Harriet, St Lawrence rd, Notting hill. May 17. Swopestone, York at west, Commercial rd east
Wright, William Madox, Park village west, Regent's park, Esq. April 30. Mott, Bedford row

TUESDAY, March 9, 1875.

Applis, Lewellin Trugard, Camden rd, Gent. April 3. Horrex, South square, Gray's inn
Atmore, Richard Bowles, East Harling, Norfolk, Gent. March 31. Lane, Kenninshall
Beckwith, Catherine Ronce, Clifton Hall Asylum, near Manchester. April 24. Sharp, Lymington
Bilton, Ann, Penketh, Lancashire. April 15. Bretherton, Warrington
Bullen, Charles James, Newton st, Clift st, Hoxton. April 10. Tatham and Sons, staple inn, Holborn
Bunting, Alexander Hall, Stockwell rd, Clapham rd, Commission Agent. April 6. Chapple and Welch, Carter lane
Chapman, Elizabeth, Westbourne terrace rd. April 15. James and Co, Ely place, Holborn
Collingwood, Edwin, Rochdale, Lancashire, Distributor of Stamps. April 23. Brerley, Rochdale
Cooper, Edmund Richard, Great Malvern, Worcester, Esq. April 20. Cole and Co, Essex st, Strand
Cooper, Robert, Litchfield rd, Grove rd, Bow, Engineer. April 30. Kutter, King's Bench walk, Temple
Cor, Jonathan, Southampton, Contractor. April 9. James Carpenter, South Front, Kingsland place, Southampton
Dawson, Daniel, Hove, Sussex, Hotel Keeper. April 2. Penfold and Son, Brighton
Dyson, Joseph, Sheffield, Gent. March 25. Parker and Son, Sheffield
Griffin, Frances Sophia, Torquay, Devonshire. April 30. Bosanquet, Austin friars
Hedfield, Job, Burton-on-Trent, Stafford, Joiner. March 28. Perks, Burton-on-Trent
Haldry, Hugh, Welling, Kent, Esq. April 10. Hunter, Jun, Liverpool
Hardy, Eliza Ann, Sible Heddington, Essex. March 31. Stevens and Bawtree, Witham
Harvey, Stephen, Park terrace, Moors park rd, Fulham, Servant. April 16. Harvey, Finchley rd, Kennington
James, Thomas, Pant Farm, Llangatlock Lingoed, Monmouth, Farmer. March 25. Walford and Gabb, Abergavenny
Jupp, Eliza, Spring grove, Isleworth. May 1. Hewitt, Nicholas lane, Lombard st
Kevin, Charles, Oxford terrace, Madras Medical Service. July 1. Clarke and Co, Gresham House, Old Broad st
Knight, John, Bridport, Dorset, Licensed Victualler. April 6. Loggin, Bridport
Lohrey, Thomas, York, Timber Merchant. Watson and Whitehead, Pickering
Lyle, Henry, Regent's park rd, Lieut Col. May 6. Wilde and Co, College hill
Peppercorn, Mary, Lordship rd, Stoke Newington. April 2. Gedge and Co, Old Palace yard, Westminster
Pode, Charles, Brighton, Sussex, Riding Master. April 3. Goodman, Brighton
Salon, George, Pickering, York, Stone Mason. April 1. Watson and Whitehead, Pickering
Shaw, Elizabeth Bragg, Dorking, Surrey. April 15. James and Co, Ely place, Holborn
Sleight, Mary Ann, New Bond st. April 9. Lumley and Lumley, Conduit st, Bond st
Spearman, Sir Alexander Young, Hanwell, Middlesex, Bart. May 8. Lowe, Tandle court, Temple
Temple, Thomas William, Blakeney, Norfolk, Esq. April 10. Goodwin, Norwich
Tuck, David Dulley, Blackheath, Wine Merchant. April 1. Packer and Son, Lewisham
Webster, Alexander, Low Foulsham, Westmorland. April 15. Talbot, Milnthorpe
Wickenden, Thomas, Frindsbury, Kent, Gent. April 30. Wordsworth and Co, Threadneedle st
Woodhouse, James Parker, Ladbroke grove, Kensington park, Esq. May 1. Atumers and Co, New square, Lincoln's inn

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, March 5, 1875.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Dando, Edward Augustus, Strand, Secretary. Pet March 1. Brougham. March 19 at 11
Dickin, John Bate Edward, Redcross st, Lace Manufacturer. Pet March 3. Spring-Rice. Esq. March 19 at 12.30
Higgins, William, Jun, Rodney rd, Watworth rd, Grocer. Pet March 2. Brougham. March 19 at 12
Holbrook, Albert, Raphael st, Knightsbridge, Hoisier. Pet March 4. Pepps. March 16 at 12
Lewis, William Robert, and Frank Edward Turner, Queen st, Victuallers. Pet March 3. Roche. March 25 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Bell, John, St Columb, Cornwall, Innkeeper. Pet March 1. Chilcott. Truro, March 17 at 11
Cruth, Levy, Newport, Monmouth, General Dealer. Pet March 3. Roberts. Newport, March 17 at 11
Laidler, William James, Halifax, York, Solicitor's Clerk. Pet March 2. Rankin. Halifax, March 18 at 11
Martin, James Conolly, Deal, Kent, Attorney. Pet March 2. Callaway. Canterbury, March 17 at 12.30
Overton, Arthur, Cambridge, Carrier. Pet March 1. Eaden. Cambridge, March 16 at 3
Wilkinson, Monce, Sheffield, Chemist. Pet March 4. Wake. Sheffield, March 15 at 10.30

TUESDAY, March 9, 1875.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Duncan, William Elliott, Cannon st, Attorney. Pet March 2. Haslitt. March 24 at 11
Fereday, Joseph, Arabella row, Buckingham Palace rd, Banker. Pet Dec 5, 1874. Brougham. March 19 at 1
Lemon, Samuel, Maddox st, Regent st, Tailor. Pet March 5. Roche. March 23 at 1
Thistleton, James Morris, Old Quebec st, Portman square, Medical Galvanist. Pet March 6. Pepps. March 23 at 12

To Surrender in the Country.

Billany, Charles, Leeds, Grocer. Pet March 3. Marshall. Leeds, March 24 at 11
Leigh, Thomas, Manchester, Tailor. Pet March 4. Kay. Manchester, March 25 at 9.30
Lomax, John, Oldham, Lancashire, Grocer. Pet March 4. Tweedale. Oldham, March 24 at 11.30
Lythgoe, Oliver, and William Gledhill, Southport, Lancashire, Cabinet Makers. Pet March 5. Watson. Liverpool, March 23 at 2
Martin, Charles, Elms Frindsbury, Kent, Gent. Pet March 5. Acworth. Rochester, April 3 at 11
Nicholson, Thomas Henry, Derby, Ribbon Manufacturer. Pet March 5. Waller. Derby, March 23 at 12
Rolling, David, Bradford, York, Coal Dealer. Pet March 5. Robinson. Bradford, March 23 at 9
Ward, William, Lincoln, Grocer. Pet March 5. Uppieby. Lincoln, March 30 at 11
Wood, William, East Moulsey, Surrey, Tax Collector. Pet March 4. Bell. Kingston, March 25 at 3
Wooliam, George, Wem, Salop, Innkeeper. Peele. Shrewsbury, adjourned until March 13 at 11

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, March 5, 1875.

Drysdale, George, Cambridge st, Merchant's Clerk. Feb 26
Gordon, Charles Edward Tudor, Cape of Good Hope, no occupation. March 3
Lovett, William, Eccleston square. March 2
Pocutt, Hutchison, Warley Barracks, Essex, Lieutenant. Feb 25
Welch, John Thomas, Twerton, nr Bath, Somerset, Licensed Victualler. Feb 26

TUESDAY, March 9, 1875.

Drysdale, George, Cambridge st, Merchant's Clerk. Feb 26
Griggs, Isaac, Shering, Essex, Farmer. Feb 23
Furridge, Joseph Roby, Great Winchester st. March 5
Sturdy, Thomas, Ludgate hill, African Merchant. March 4

Liquidation by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, March 5, 1875.

Adams, Benjamin, Birmingham, Beer Retailer. March 17 at 11 at offices of Webb and Spencer, New st, Birmingham
Akhurst, George, Maidstone, Kent, Grocer. March 18 at 12.30 at offices of Monckton and Co, King st, Maidstone
Allaway, Thomas, William Allaway, and James Allaway, Lydney, Gloucester, Tinsplate Manufacturers. March 17 at 1.30 at offices of Barnard and Co, Albion chambers, Bristol
Ashberry, John Arthur, Sheffield, Britannia Metal Manufacturer. March 17 at 12 at offices of Tattershall, Queen st, Sheffield
Basham, Arthur, and John Varley, Princes rd, Kennington cross, Builders. March 19 at 12 at offices of Cooke, Essex st, Strand
Bellis, Edward, Bromfield crescent, Harrow rd, Paddington, Coal Dealer. March 23 at 2 at offices of Chalk, Moorgate st
Biggs, Charles, Romford, Essex, Grocer. March 12 at 2 at offices of Carter and Bell, Loadenball st
Bottle, Frederick Conyngham, Woodford, Essex, Draper. March 25 at 2 at offices of Stapcoole, Pinner's hall, Old Broad st
Boyce, Robert, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Grocer. March 18 at 2.30 at offices of Jenkins and Co, High st, Cardiff. Heard, Cardiff
Bridges, Job Edwin, Edenbridge rd, Hackney, Saddler. March 11 at 2 at 27, Finsbury pavement. Annul
Bull, Rev William Lowndes, Bankfoot Vicarage, Bradford, York. March 18 at 3 at offices of Kennolly, Tyrryl st, Bradford
Byrne, Andrew Esing, Liverpool, Commission Merchant. March 22 at 3 at offices of Hull and Co, Cook st, Liverpool
Calisher, Bertram James, Sackville st, Piccadilly, Commission Agent. March 16 at 3 at offices of Abrahams, Burlington gardens, Bond st
Carmichael, John Duncan, Cleveland row, St James's, Gent. March 15 at 3 at offices of Groust, Suffolk lane, Cannon st
Carter, John, Liverpool, Draper. March 22 at 3 at offices of Barrell and Rodway, Lord st, Liverpool
Charleton, John Foster, and Peter Weightman, South Shields, Durham, Brassfounders. March 19 at 11.30 at offices of Tinsley and Co, Howard st, North Shields
Choat, Frederick, Slough, Bucks, Oilman. March 18 at 12 at offices of Reader, Gray's inn square
Clasby, John, York, Publican. March 16 at 1 at offices of Watson, Lendal, York
Clegg, James, Oldham, Lancashire, Ironmonger. March 19 at 3 at offices of Gardiner, Brown st, Manchester
Cook, William, Burton-on-Trent, Stafford, Labourer. March 15 at 12 at the Wool Pack Inn, West Bond st, Leicester. Wilson, Burton-on-Trent
Crisk, Alexander, Treadmouth, Berwick-upon-Tweed, Blacksmith. March 18 at 1 at offices of Joel, Newgate st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Crosser, James, Radcliffe, Lancashire, Engineer. March 17 at 3 at the Clarence Hotel, Spring gardens, Manchester. Grandy and Co, Bury
Croxon, Mary, Park place, St James's, Hotel Keeper. March 31 at 12 at offices of Watney, Clement's lane
Davies, John, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Boot Dealer. March 19 at 3 at offices of Stirk, North st, Wolverhampton

Davies, Lewis Oswald, Aberystwith, Cardigan, Draper. March 18 at 11 offices of Hughes and Son, North parade, Aberystwith.

Dean, James, Queen Elizabeth st, Hereford, Licensed Victualler. March 22 at 2 at offices of Payne, Serjeants inn, Temple.

Dracup, Arthur, Little Horton, Bradford, York, Shuttle Maker. March 15 at 11 at offices of Rhodes, Duke st, Bradford.

Ellwood, John, Carlisle, Labourer. March 17 at 2 at offices of Ostell, Bank st, Carlisle.

Evans, John, Rhymer, Monmouth, Grocer. March 22 at 2 at offices of Williams and Co, Exchange, Bristol. Waldron, Cardiff.

Formby, John, Liverpool, Ironmonger. March 18 at 3 at offices of Lepton, Harrington st, Liverpool.

Friedheim, Robert Carl Louis, Doddington grove west, Kennington park, Commercial Clerk. March 13 at 11 at offices of Philipott, Guildhall chambers.

Gaer, John, Glamafon Lodge, Llanfair Dyffynelwyd, Denbigh, Joiner. March 18 at 12 at the Wynnstay Arms Hotel, Wrexham.

Lloyd, jun, Ruthin.

Giles, William, Kent st, Southwark, Licensed Victualler. March 13 at 11 at the Claremont Arms Tavern, Upper Grange rd, Bermondsey.

Bilton, Henfrow rd, Kennington lane.

Gill, John, Lucas st, Commercial rd, E. Waterproofer. March 12 at 2 at offices of Harris, Duke st, Manchester square.

Green, Alfred, Barnet, Hertford, Grocer. March 22 at 2 at offices of Wells, Paternoster row.

Griffiths, William, Aston-juxta-Birmingham, Pork Butcher. March 17 at 11 at offices of Free, Temple row, Birmingham.

Hammond, John, Woodside terrace, Gipsy hill, Norwood, Oilman. March 18 at 12 at offices of Plunkett, Gutter lane.

Hammond, William Henry, Broadway, Stratford, Tailor. March 27 at 2 at Bedford House, Stratford green. May, Princes st, Spital square.

Harris, Charles Ray, Mincing lane, Commission Merchant. March 18 at 12 at offices of Morrison, Cannon st.

Henshaw, Charles, Kearsley Moor, Lancashire, Coal Carter. March 17 at 3 at offices of Dawson and Scowcroft, Exchange at east, Bolton.

Hillyer, Frederick, Bristol, Grocer. March 19 at 11 at offices of Ward, Broad st, Bristol.

Hilton, John, Farnworth, Lancashire, Ironfounder. March 22 at 3 at the Victoria Hotel, Hotel st, Bolton. Dawson and Scowcroft, Bolton.

Holden, George, jun, Walsall, Stafford, Licensed Victualler. March 18 at 3 at offices of Glover, Park st, Walsall.

Hooke, Samuel, Flaxman rd, Chamberrell, Commission Agent. March 16 at 2 at offices of Hilderton, London st, Fenchurch st.

Keworth, Henry, Nelson-in-Marsden, Lancashire, Draper. March 23 at 11.30 at offices of Sutcliffe, Grimshawe st, Burnley.

Hughes, Morris, Llanyngheddie, Anglesey, Saddler. March 20 at 2 at the George Inn, Holyhead. Jones, Menai bridge.

Jackson, Henry, Middlesborough, York, Merchant Tailor. March 17 at 11 at Barker's Temperance Hotel, Bridge at west, Middlesborough.

Jarman, David, Treorchy, Ystradgofdyw, Glamorgan, Grocer. March 17 at 12 at the Post Office chambers, Pontypridd. Rosser, Aberdare.

Jay, Enoch, Fovant, Wilts, Builder. March 17 at 3 at the County Court Office, Salisbury. Coates, Salisbury.

Kearseley, John, Middlesborough, York, Licensed Victualler. March 17 at 11 at offices of Robinson, Chancery lane, Darlington.

Keeping, William, Wimborne Minster, Dorset, Wheelwright. March 15 at 11 at the Crown Inn, Wimborne Minster. Moore and Bowers, Wimborne Minster.

Keir, Andrew, Swinhoe, Northumberland, Farmer. March 17 at 12 at offices of Bush, St Nicholas buildings, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Kirton, John, Northampton, Grocer. March 16 at 3 at offices of Becke, Market square, Northampton.

Leach, George, Basinghall st, Machinist. March 20 at 11 at offices of Blackburn, Park row, Leeds. Leary and Co, Moorgate st.

Lever, John, Ramshotton, Lancashire, Stonemason. March 19 at 3 at offices of Remwell and Pennington, Mawdsley st, Bolton.

Marsden, James, Chorley, Lancashire, Innkeeper. March 17 at 11 at offices of Morris, Town Hall chambers, Chorley.

Marsland, Thomas, Laisterdyke, Bradford, York, Commission Wool Comber. March 23 at 4 at offices of Neill, Union passage, Bradford.

May, Thomas, jun, Kingston-upon-Hull, Fisherman. March 23 at 3 at 8, Parliament st, Kingston-upon-Hull. Woodhouse.

Meyers, Frederick, Barnsley, York, Watchmaker. March 18 at 12 at Cutlers' Hall, Church at, Sheffield. Mellor, Bank st, Sheffield.

Miljen, Alfred Canney, Great College st, Camden town, Seed Merchant. March 22 at 3 at the Law Institution, Chancery lane.

Mullins, James, Bishop's Cleeve, Gloucester, Gardener. March 17 at 10 at offices of Boodie, Bedford buildings, Clarence st, Cheltenham.

Norris, Alexander, Torton, Lancashire, Builder. March 24 at 3 at the Victoria Hotel, Hotel st, Bolton. Dawson and Scowcroft, Bolton.

Osmond, Reuben John, Teignmouth, Devon, Baker. March 18 at 12 at the Castle Hotel, Castle st, Exeter. Froud, Exeter.

Pochin, Stephen John, Charlesworth, Leicester, Elastic Web Manufacturer. March 19 at 2 at offices of Fowler and Co, Friar lane, Leicester.

Poole, James Guy, Grosvenor park, Camberwell, Commercial Traveller. March 20 at 12 at offices of Lovelock and Whiffin, Coleman st. Robinson, Gresham house, Old Broad st.

Potts, Alfred, Bramhall, Stockport, Cheshire, Dealer in Yeast. March 22 at 3 at offices of Bent, Piccadilly, Manchester.

Reading, George, Fish st hill, London bridge, occupation. March 22 at 2 at offices of Verne, Strand.

Reynolds, Lorenzo Jerrall, Norwich, Boot Manufacturer. March 18 at 3 at offices of Sedd and Linay, Theatre st, Norwich.

Rodman, William, Carlisle, Saw Maker. March 17 at 3 at offices of Wannop, Carruthers court, Scotch st, Carlisle.

Saunders, Thomas Charles, Brynston st, Portman square, Grocer. March 18 at 10 at offices of Berkeley, Marylebone rd.

Scott, George, Park place, South Hackney, out of business. March 24 at 2 at offices of Barrett, Leadenhall st.

Smith, Edmund, West Ham, Essex, Carpenter. March 18 at 3 at offices of Wood and Hare, Basinghall st.

Smith, Thomas, Stanton Long, Salop, Farmer. March 18 at 12 at the Talbot Inn, March Wenlock.

Smylie, Robert, Birmingham, Factor. March 24 at 3 at offices of Rowlands and Bagnall, Colmore row, Birmingham.

Stephenson, William Robson, Durham, Tallow Chandler. March 19 at 12 at offices of Proctor, jun, Silver st, Durham.

Stringer, Frederick, Bilston, Stafford, Furniture Dealer. March 20 at 11 at offices of Underhill, Darlington st, Wolverhampton.

Thomas, David, Cefnlechladd, Carmarthen, Farmer. March 19 at 10.30 at offices of Evans, Queen st, Carmarthen.

Thompson, John, Little Bolton, Lancashire, Drysalter. March 17 at 3 at offices of Rutter, Mawdsley st, Bolton.

Tomlin, Joseph Nigraue, Leicester, Cutler. March 18 at 1 at offices of Hunter, Halford st, Leicester.

Turner, Henry Robert, Cambridge, Innkeeper. March 17 at 12 at 8, Bonet st, Cambridge.

Tutt, Francis, Wisford, Wilts, Butcher. March 18 at 3 at offices of Hodding, Market House, Salisbury.

Tytherleigh, William, Great Russell st, Bloomsbury, Hosier. March 15 at 2 at offices of Nunn and Winkworth, Princes st, Cavendish square.

Vale, Thomas, Leckhampton, Gloucester, Teacher of Music. March 15 at 12 at offices of Potter, North place, Cheltenham.

Vorley, Peter, Rushden, Northampton, Dealer in Drugs. March 18 at 3 at the Green Dragon Hotel, Higham Ferrers. Simpson.

Walter, Edwin, Ewell rd, Surbiton hill. March 17 at 1 at Muller's Hotel, Ironmonger lane. Seymour, Cophall buildings.

Webb, Robert, Ledbury, Hereford, Butcher. March 18 at 11 at offices of Piper, Court house, Ledbury.

West, Edwin William, Vere st, Clare market. March 22 at 11 at offices of Button and Co, Henrietta st, Covent garden.

Wilkinson, John, Liverpool, Coach Builder. March 22 at 3 at offices of Masters and Fletcher, North John st, Liverpool.

Wilks, John, Plymouth, Devon, Fish Merchant. March 18 at 12 at offices of Square, George st, Plymouth.

Williams, Francis Albert, Wigmora st, Cavendish square, Grocer. March 17 at 12 at the London Tavern, Bishopsgate st. Willicombe, Fenchurch st.

Williams, John, Carnarvon, Labourer. March 22 at 1 at the Harp Hotel, Conway. Hammonds, Llanrwst.

Wintle, Henry, Bristol, Hackney Carriage Driver. March 13 at 11 at offices of Esary, Guildhall, Broad st, Bristol.

TUESDAY, MARCH 9, 1875.

Bailey, James, Pensance, Cornwall, Boot Maker. March 21 at 11 at offices of Boncorrie and son, North Parade, Pensance.

Barlow, Ashworth, and Moses Barlow, Crawshaw Booth, Lancashire, Cotton Spinners. March 24 at 3 at offices of Addishaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester.

Blackborow, Edwin, Newport, Monmouth, Gardier. March 20 at 11 at offices of Gibbs, Commercial st, Newport.

Bowtell, Henry William, Emsenham, Essex, Horse Dealer. March 18 at 12 at offices of Baker, Bishop's Stortford.

Britten, Samuel, Northampton, Shoe Manufacturer. March 19 at 11 at offices of Becke, Market square, Northampton.

Brown, Albert, Outwell, Norfolk, Grocer. March 18 at 11 at offices of O'hard and Co, Uni in place crescent, Wisbech.

Butler, George Meecher, Windsor, Berks, Grocer. March 22 at 3 at offices of Hicklin and Washington, Trinity square, Southwark.

Caines, George, St George, Gloucester, Baker. March 17 at 11 at the Radnor Hotel, Nicholas st, Bristol.

Canham, Thomas, Oxford st, Mile end, Undertaker. March 23 at 12 at offices of Dewy, Mark lane.

Casril, Bennett, Kingston-upon-Hull, Clothier. March 22 at 2 at offices of Torry, Coran's chambers, Bowlsley lane, Kingston-upon-Hull.

Clark, John Walters, Walsall, Stafford, Coach Builder. March 19 at 3 at offices of Glover, Park st, Walsall.

Cleaver, Richard, Leamington Priors, Warwick, Fishmonger. March 23 at 3 at offices of Wilson, Bennett's hill, Birmingham. Simmon, Birmingham.

Coker, William, Treforest, Glamorgan, Grocer. March 20 at 1 at the Cardiff Arms Hotel, Broad st, Cardiff. Hollier and Williams, Pontypridd.

Copping, Stephen John, Agnes terrace, Tabernacle walk, Finsbury, Box Manufacturer. March 24 at 11.30 at offices of Aird, Eastcheap.

Crammer, Thomas, East Dereham, Norfolk, Musician. March 25 at 11 at offices of Saunders, East Dereham.

Crompton, Robert Andrews, and Henry Cooke, Chorlton-upon-Medlock, Manchester. March 19 at 2.30 at the Clarence Hotel, Spring gardens, Manchester. Blair.

Cushion, John Charles, Leipzig rd, Canabwell, Commercial Traveller. March 17 at 3 at offices of Unippsfield and Sturt, Trinity st, Southwark.

Dewar, John Waite Campbell, Southampton, Merchant's Clerk. March 17 at 3 at offices of Shute, Portland st, Southampton.

Dunn, Thomas, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Furniture Dealer. March 19 at 11 at offices of Keenlyside and Forster, Grainger st west, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Dyke, Richard, Market Lavington, Wilts, Hair Dresser. March 23 at 11 at 17, Market place, Devizes, Hancock.

Erwin, James, Saffron Walden, Essex, Miller. March 18 at 11 at the Rose and Crown Hotel, Saffron Walden. Ellison and Burrows, Cambridge.

Ferguson, James, Swansea, Glamorgan, Draper. March 20 at 11 at offices of Glasodine, Fisher st, Swansea.

Fleet, John, Buckley, Flint, Grocer. March 22 at 2 at offices of Bridgman and Co, Westminster building, Newgate st, Chester.

Foxhill, Frederick John, Loughborough rd, Brixton, Watch Maker. March 22 at 2 at offices of Parker and Locke, Pavement, Finsbury.

Foster, John, Nottingham, Saddler. March 25 at 11 at offices of Black, Low pavement, Nottingham.

Gage, John, Ashwell, Hertford, Schoolmaster. March 25 at 1 at the Swan Inn, Ashwell. Wade-Gery, Sheffield.

Goody, Thomas, Birmingham, Photograph Frame Maker. March 20 at 11 at the White Horse Hotel, Congreve st, Birmingham. Edwards.

Green, Richard, Warren st, Pentonville, Boot Maker. March 16 at 3 at offices of Hudgell, Gresham st. Gray, Gresham st.

Grindrod, Jonathan, jun, Parkgate, Chester, Gent. March 19 at 3 at offices of Crozier and Lumb, Moorfields, Liverpool.

Hardy, George Thomas, Yeovil, Somerset, out of business. March 27 at 11 at offices of Glyde, Wyndham House, Princes st, Yeovil.

Hardy, Thomas, Stockton-on-Tees, Durham, Auctioneer. March 23 at 11 at 13, Finkle st, Stockton-on-Tees. Fawcett and Co.

Harris, William, Tewkesbury, Gloucester, Baker. March 23 at 11 at offices of Moores and Romney, Tewkesbury.

Whitby, John, Littledean hill, Gloucester, Boot Maker. March 23 at 2 at offices of Whitley and Co, Gloucester

Widdows, Joseph, Ambleside, Westmorland, Joiner. March 22 at 11.30 at "Rig's" Hotel, Windermere. Fisher and Gately, Ambleside

Widdinson, Barnabas, Wotton, nr Northwich, Cheshire, Boot Maker. April 1 at 2 at the Royal Hotel, Crewe. Fletcher, Northwich

Wood, Henry, Bristol, Leather Catter. March 14 at 12 at offices of Plummer, Nicholas at, Bristol

Woodward, John, Hastings, Sussex, out of business. April 1 at 3 at offices of Levene, York buildings, Hastings

Worm, Samuel, Rotherham, York, Bootmaker. March 24 at 3 at offices of Oxley and Pashley, Westgate, Rotherham

Worland, Lydia, Erith, Kent, Grocer. March 20 at 12 at offices of Gibson, Dartford

Jacobson, Solomon Nathan, and Abraham Nathan Jacobson, Hounsditch, Dealers in Fancy Goods. March 18 at 11 at 145, Cheapside, Barnet

Yells, Alfred, and Edward Roberts, Llanely, Carmarthen, Fishmongers. March 23 at 11 at offices of Howell, Park at, Llanely

Yule, Samuel, Birmingham, Plumber. March 18 at 12 at offices of Booker, Moor st, Birmingham. Joynt, Birmingham

Johnson, George Henry, Birmingham, Fruiterer. March 22 at 3 at offices of Rowlands, Ann st, Birmingham

Jones, Francis George, Grove rd, Holloway, Corn Merchant. March 23 at 3 at offices of Berry and Co, Farringdon at

Jones, Robert, Manchester, Yarn Merchant. March 25 at 3 at offices of Edd, John Allen, Bentham, York, Grocer. March 23 at 11 at the King's Arms Hotel, Lancaster. Willcock, Wolverhampton

Kirks, Cyrus Baker, Lime st, Wine Merchant. March 23 at 1 at offices of Hudson, Furnival's inn

Lewis, Abraham, Cuddington, Cheshire, Timber Carrier. March 23 at 10.15 at offices of Cooke, Winsford

Uly, William, jun, Cambridge, Wine Merchant. March 22 at 2 at 1, Pety Curry, Cambridge. Baker, Bishop's Stortford

Loney, John Felix, Saltash, Cornwall, Retired Captain R.N. March 22 at 11 at offices of Wilkes, Courtenay st, Plymouth. Vaughan, Devonport

Lech, William Turner, Great Portland st, Builder. March 23 at 9 at the Masons' Hall Tavern, Masons' avenue, Basinghall st. Burt, Arzyl st, Regent st

Nabe, John, Tenby, Pembroke, Butcher. March 19 at 1 at the Coburg Hotel, Tenby. Glascombe, Swansea

Martin, James, Birmingham, Cabinet Maker. March 19 at 11 at the Acorn Hotel, Temple st, Birmingham. Stratton, Wolverhampton

McCracken, Samuel, Bradford, York, Jeweller. March 22 at 3 at offices of Davies, Bennett's hill, Birmingham

Howe, Henry, Nottingham, Builder. March 19 at 12 at offices of Blackwell, St Peter's Church walk, Nottingham

Merrill, James, Bradford, Lancashire, Ironworker. March 26 at 3 at the Arcade Hotel, Market st, Manchester. Law, Manchester

Mohan, Louis, Newport, Monmouth, Outfitter. March 23 at 2 at offices of Barnard and Co, Albion chambers, Bristol. Stephens, Cardiff

Never, James, Birmingham, Retail Brewer. March 24 at 3 at offices of Parry, Bennett's hill, Birmingham

Newlands, Peter, and James Greenwood, Ashton-under-Lyne, Lancashire, Ironfounders. March 24 at 3 at offices of Darnton and Bottomley, Stamford at, Ashton-under-Lyne

O'Connor, Patrick William, Little Guildford st, Southwark, Carman. March 17 at 12 at offices of George and Edwards, Wool Exchange, Coleman at

Gay, Samuel Frederick, Middlesborough, York, out of business. March 18 at 12 at offices of Peacock, Middlesborough

Oliver, George, Crewe Town, Cheshire, Licensed Victualler. March 29 at 11 at the Royal Hotel, Crewe. Brooke, Nantwich

Palmer, Frank, Basingstoke, Hampshire, Draper's Assistant. March 23 at 12 at offices of Coitching, South st, Horsham

Pearer, John, Consett, Durham, Dealer in Jewellery. March 23 at 11 at offices of Johnston, Pilgrim st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Pickles, William, Halifax, York, Worsted Spinner. March 24 at 3 at the White Lion Hotel, Halifax. Storey, Halifax

Phillips, David, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Draper. March 25 at 2 at offices of Barnard and Co, Albion chambers, Bristol. Stephens, Cardiff

Pope, John Raymond, Shapridge, Gloucester, Farmer. March 18 at 2 at offices of Taynton and Son, Clarence chambers, Gloucester

Proctor, Edward, Newark-upon-Trent, Nottingham, Boot Maker. March 23 at 13 at the Rutland Arms Hotel, Barnby gate, Newark-upon-Trent. Newton

Puffett, Robert, Broadwall, Christ Church, Lambeth, Baker. March 22 at 3 at offices of Russell, Coleman at

Reese, Elizabeth, Budleigh Salterton, Devon, Milliner. March 17 at 12 at the Castle Hotel, Castle st, Exeter. Flood, Exeter

Rewe, Alfred, Sudbury, Suffolk, Hairdresser. March 17 at 2 at the Anchor Hotel, Sudbury. Mumford, Sudbury

Ruwell, James, Swansea, Glamorgan, Boot Maker. March 28 at 11 at offices of Davies and Harland, Swansea

Scitlow, Nathan, Amberley Wharf, Harrow rd, Paddington, Cab Proprietor. March 17 at 12 at the Castle Hotel, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields. Abblett, Cambridge terrace, Hyde park

Sheppard, Frank, Southampton, Boot Dealer. March 23 at 12 at offices of Guy, Albion terrace, Southampton

Shirley, Ellen Moore, Mortimer st, Cavendish square, Boarding House Keeper. March 17 at 11 at offices of Norman, Old Bond st

Smith, Charles Edward, Lyndhurst, Southampton, Tailor. March 23 at 12 at the Guildhall Office House, Grosvenor st, Cowell, Lyndington

Smelling, Francis, Bessborough st, Pimlico, Job Master. April 3 at 3 at offices of Teco and Warner, Hart st, Bloomsbury square

Squib, Frederick George, Wandsworth rd, Cheesemonger. March 22 at 3 at offices of Hubbard, London Joint Stock Bank chambers, West Smithfield

Stagg, Frederick Nelson, Wootton Bassett, Wilts, Innkeeper. March 23 at 11 at the Angel Inn, Wootton Bassett. Mullings and Co, Wootton Bassett

Stuck, William, East Hunsall, Somerset, Cattle Dealer. March 19 at 12 at offices of Reed and Cook, Bridgewater

Yates, Albert, Huddersfield, York, Shopkeeper. March 23 at 11 at the White Swan Hotel, Huddersfield

Taylor, John, Altrincham, Cheshire, Smallware Dealer. March 22 at 3 at offices of Addleshaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester

Titterton, James Holdsworth, Halifax, York, Dealer in Carpets. March 18 at 3 at the White Lion Hotel, Halifax. Jubb, Halifax

Tomkinson, Arthur John, Liverpool, Salt Manufacturer. March 22 at 2 at offices of Etty, Lord st, Liverpool

Walters, John Thomas, Canterbury, Printer. March 23 at 1 at the Rose Hotel, Canterbury. Delassaux, Canterbury

Wharton, George, Birstal, York, Boot Maker. March 22 at 2.30 at the Mirfield Station Refreshment Rooms. Ibberson

Whittaker, Joseph, Oldham, Lancashire, Joiner. March 23 at 3 at offices of Rowley and Co, Clarence buildings, Booth st, Manchester

Wilkinson, Mence, Osborne terrace, Clapham rd, Farmer. March 23 at 11 at the Exeter Hotel, Strand. Hicks and Arnold, Salisbury st, Strand

Wilkinson, Thomas, Scarborough, York, Ironfounder. March 25 at 3 at offices of Dawber, Westborough, Scarborough. Calvert, York

Wise, Emma, Nottingham, Book Dealer. March 24 at 11 at offices of Black, Low pavement, Nottingham

Wood, Edmund, Waterloo rd, Guasimith. March 15 at 10 at offices of Kisch and Co, Wellington st, Strand

Workman, Rev Murray Richard, Great Russell st, Bloomsbury. March 22 at 3 at offices of Lamb, Bedford row

Wright, James, Leeds, Corn Miller. March 23 at 3 at offices of Fawcett and Malcolm, Park row, Leeds

FUNERAL REFORM.—The exorbitant items of the Undertaker's bill have long operated as an oppressive tax upon all classes of the community. With a view of applying a remedy to this serious evil the LONDON NECROPOLIS COMPANY, when opening their extensive cemetery at Woking, held themselves prepared to undertake the whole duties relating to interments at fixed and moderate scales of charge, from which survivors may choose according to their means and the requirements of the case. The Company also undertakes the conduct of Funerals to other cemeteries, and to all parts of the United Kingdom. A pamphlet containing full particulars may be obtained, or will be forwarded, upon application to the Chief Office, 3 Lancaster-place Strand, W.C.

EDE AND SON,
ROBE AND MAKERS.
BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,
To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench, Corporation of London, &c.
SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.
BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSEL'S DITTO.
CORPORATION ROBES, UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS, &c
ESTABLISHED 1669.
94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

LONDON GAZETTE (published by authority) and LONDON and COUNTRY ADVERTISEMENT OFFICE.
No. 117, CHANCERY LANE, FLEET STREET.
HENRY GREEN, Advertisement Agent, begs to direct the attention of the Legal Profession to the advantages of his long experience of upwards of twenty-five years, in the special insertion of all pro forma notices, &c., and hereby solicits their continued support.—N.B. One copy of advertisement only required, and the strictest care and promptitude assured. Officially stamped forms for advertisement and file of "London Gazette" kept. By appointment.

YATES & ALEXANDER,
PRINTERS, LITHOGRAPHERS, STATIONERS,
ETC.
SYMONDS INN, 22, CHANCERY-LANE,
LONDON.
Every description of Printing.
Chancery Bills and Answers Catalogues
Appeals Prospectuses
Parliamentary Minutes Magazines
Books Newspapers
Pamphlets Circulars
Reports Posters
Rules Handbills, &c., &c.

CARR'S, 265, STRAND.—Dinners (from the joint) vegetables, &c., 1s. 6d., or with Soup or Fish, 2s. and 2s. 6d. "If I desire a substantial dinner of the joint, with the agreeable accompaniment of light wine, both cheap and good, I know only of one house, and that is in the Strand, close to Danes Inn. There you may wash down the roast beef of Old England with excellent Burgundy, at two shillings a bottle, or you may be supplied with half a bottle for a shilling."—All the Year Round, June, 15, 1864, 400 page.
The new Hall lately added is one of the handsomest dining-rooms in London. Dinners (from the joint), vegetables, &c., 1s. 6d.

STOOPING HABITS, ROUND SHOULDERS,
PIGEON CHESTS, and other Deformities, are prevented and cured by wearing Dr. HANDLER'S IMPROVED HYGIENIC CHEST EXPANDING BRACE, for both Sexes of all ages. It strengthens the voice and lungs, relieves indigestion, pains in the chest and back, and is especially recommended to children for assisting the growth, promoting health and symmetry of figure, superseding the use of braces and stays. Price from 10s. 6d. each.—69, BARNES-STREET, OXFORD-STREET W. Illustrated circulars forwarded.

CHARLES BALDWIN LEVER, deceased.—Pursuant to Act of Parliament 22nd & 23rd Vict., c. 35, intitled, "An Act to further amend the law of property and to relieve trustees," notice is hereby given that all creditors and other persons having any claims and demands upon or against the estate of the said Charles Baldwin Lever, late of 49, Bedford-row, and of 25, Norfolk-crescent, Hyde-park, both in the county of Middlesex, So licitor, deceased (who died at No. 25, Norfolk-crescent aforesaid on the 20th of December, 1874, and whose will was duly proved by Sarah Maria Lever, of 25, Norfolk-crescent aforesaid, widow, and William George Stuart, of Terrilands, Pinner, in the county of Middlesex, and of No. 6, Gray's-inn-square, in the same county, Solicitor, the Executors named in the said will, in her Majesty's Court of Probate principal registry, on the 29th December, 1875), are hereby required to send in writing the particulars of their claims or demands, addressed to the said William George Stuart, 6, Gray's-inn-square aforesaid, on or before the 1st day of July, 1875. And notice is hereby also given that immediately after the said 1st day of July, 1875, the said Executors will proceed to distribute the assets of the said Charles Baldwin Lever amongst the persons entitled thereto, having regard only to the debts, claims, or demands of which they shall then have had notice, and the said Executors will not be answerable or liable for the assets, or any part thereof, so distributed to any person or persons of whose debts, claims, or demands they shall not have had notice at the time of such distribution.

Dated this 9th day of March, 1875.

WILLIAM GEORGE STUART.

6, Gray's-inn-square, London.

CITY OF BRISTOL.

Notice is hereby given, that the Office of CLERK TO THE JUSTICES of the City of Bristol will be shortly vacant.

The Justices will appoint a Clerk under the Municipal Corporations Act, 5 & 6 Will. 4, cap. 76, sect. 102, to hold office during their pleasure.

The gentleman to be appointed must be a solicitor, conversant with the administration and practice of criminal and magisterial law. He will be required to retire from private or other practice, and to devote his whole time to his official duties.

By arrangement with the Justices and Council, under the Local Act, 1 Vict. cap. 85, sect. 71, the Clerk will be paid by the Council out of the borough fund, by quarterly payments, the annual salary of £700 in lieu of all fees and emoluments whatever becoming due to him or in any way arising out of his official employment.

In consideration of the aforesaid salary, he will be required to perform all such duties as are now or hereafter may be imposed on him as a clerk by any statutes now or hereafter to be in force or by direction of the Justices.

It will be his duty to collect all fees and emoluments of the office, whether payable to him or to any constables or officers of the police court, together with all fines and other sums of money imposed under convictions or by orders of the Justices. He must keep accurate accounts of all moneys so received, in such form as shall from time to time be prescribed by the Justices or the Council, and pay such amounts to the City Treasurer or parties to whom the same are payable—as regards the Treasurer, once every month, and as regards other parties, as soon as the several sums are respectively payable to them—and must produce, when required by the Justices, vouchers for all such payments.

He will be repaid monthly by the Treasurer all disbursements made by him during the preceding month for wages of the copying clerks employed in the office, and for all other payments properly made by him by direction of the Justices—a schedule of such disbursements, with vouchers, being first submitted to, and certified as being correct by, three Justices.

●The police-court will be provided, and the usual expenses thereof, including printing, forms, and stationery, paid by the Council.

The assistant clerks will be appointed and removed by the Justices, and their salaries paid by the Treasurer out of the borough fund. The Clerk will appoint and remove the copying clerks.

All the clerks are to be subordinate to the Clerk, and will be required to obey his reasonable orders and directions.

The Justices or Council respectively may alter the preceding regulations, and make others instead of them, and so, from time to time, as they shall think fit.

Any gentleman who may become a candidate for the office will be required to signify his assent in writing to these arrangements.

Applicants are requested to state their past and present experience, position, and age, and the opportunities they have had of becoming acquainted with the duties required of them, and when, if elected, they can undertake the duties of the office.

Copies only of testimonials are to be forwarded, in the first instance, written or printed on half-sheets of foolscap.

Applications are to be addressed to the Mayor of Bristol, endorsed "Application for Office of Justices' Clerk," and sent, under cover, to the Town Clerk, Council-house, Bristol, not later than Monday, the 5th April, 1875.

WILLIAM BRICE,

Council-house, Bristol, 3rd March, 1875. Town Clerk.

The Companies Acts, 1862 & 1867.

Every requisite under the above Acts supplied on the shortest notice.

THE BOOKS AND FORMS kept in stock for immediate use. MEMORANDA and ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION speedily printed in the proper form for registration and distribution. SHARE CERTIFICATES, DEBENTURES, &c., engraved and printed. OFFICIAL SEALS designed and executed. No charge for sketches. Companies Fee Stamps. Railway Registration Forms.

Solicitors' Account Books.

RICHARD FLINT & CO.

(Late ASH & FLINT).

Stationers, Printers, Engravers, Registration Agents, &c., 49, Fleet-street, London, E.C. (corner of Serjeants-inn). Annual and other Returns Stamped and Filed.

CLERICAL, MEDICAL, AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

13, St. James's-square, London, S.W.

City Branch: Mansion House-buildings, E.C.

FINANCIAL RESULTS.

The Annual Income, steadily increasing, exceeds	£285,000
The Assurance Fund, safely invested, is over	£1,945,000
The New Policies in the last Year were 510, assuring	£332,981
The New Annual Premiums were	£19,781
The Bonus added to Policies in January, 1872, was	£19,871
The Total Claims by Death paid amount to	£3,321,137
The subsisting Assurances and Bonuses amount to	£3,861,666

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES.

CREDIT of half the first five Annual Premiums allowed on whole-term Policies on healthy Lives not over 60 years of age.

ENDOWMENT ASSURANCES granted, without Profit, payable at death or on attaining a specified age.

INVALID LIVES assured at rates proportioned to the risk.

CLAIMS paid thirty days after proof of death.

BONUS.

The Next Division of Profits will take place in January, 1877, and Persons who effect New Policies before the end of June next will be entitled at that Division to one year's additional share of Profits over after Entrants.

REPORT, 1874.

The 50th Annual Report just issued, and the Balance Sheet for the year ending June 30, 1874, as rendered to the Board of Trade, can be obtained at either of the Society's Offices, or of any of its Agents.

GEORGE CUTLIFFE, Actuary and Secretary.

COMMISSION.

10 per Cent. on the First Premium, and 5 per Cent. on Renewals, is allowed to Solicitors. The Commission will be continued to the Person introducing the Assurance, without reference to the channel through which the Premiums may be paid.

SOVEREIGN LIFE OFFICE,

48, ST. JAMES'S-STREET, LONDON, S.W.

DIRECTORS.

Chairman—SIR JAMES CARMICHAEL, Bart.
Deputy-Chairman—JOHN ASHBURNER, Esq., M.D.
Lieutenant-Colonel BATHURST. CHARLES WILL. RETNOLES, Esq.
JOHN GARDINER, Esq. SIR J. E. EARLEY-WILMOT, Bart.

This Office makes ADVANCES on Real, and to a limited extent, on Personal Security; it presents the following advantages:—

The Security of a large accumulated Fund.

Moderate rates for all ages, climates, and circumstances connected with Life Assurance.

HENRY D. DAVENPORT, Secretary.

REVERSIONS AND LIFE INTERESTS.

THESE PROPERTIES ARE PURCHASED, OR LOANS GRANTED UPON THE SECURITY OF THEM,

BY

THE SCOTTISH EQUITABLE (MUTUAL) LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

Head Office—26, ST. ANDREW-SQUARE, EDINBURGH.

London Office—30, GRACECHURCH-STREET, E.C.

Manager—T. B. SPERGUER, Esq., M.A.

Solicitors in London.—Messrs. BURTON, YEATES, & HART, 37, Lincoln's Inn Fields.

Income, £277,700. Assets, £2,104,000

Every description of Life Insurance business transacted.

The usual Commission allowed to Solicitors.

EQUITABLE REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY, 10, LANCASTER-PLACE, STRAND.

Established 1835. Capital paid-up, £480,000.

This Society purchases reversionary property and life interests, and grants loans on these securities.

Forms of proposal may be obtained at the office.

F. S. CLAYTON, } Joint
G. H. CLAYTON, } Secretaries.

THE AGRA BANK (LIMITED)

Established in 1833.—Capital, £1,000,000.

HEAD OFFICE—NICHOLAS-LANE, LOMBARD-STREET, LONDON

BRANCHES in Edinburgh, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kurrachee, Aggra, Lahore, Shanghai, Hong Kong.

CURRENT ACCOUNTS are kept at the Head Office on the terms customary with London bankers, and interest allowed when the credit balance does not fall below £100.

DEPOSITS received for fixed periods on the following terms, viz.—At 5 per cent. per annum, subject to 12 months' notice of withdrawal. For shorter periods deposits will be received on terms to be agreed upon. Bills issued at the current exchange of the day on any of the Branches of the Bank free of extra charge; and approved bills purchased or sent for collection.

SALES AND PURCHASES effected in British and foreign securities, in East India Stock and loans, and the safe custody of the same undertaken interest drawn, and army, navy, and civil pay and pensions realised. Every other description of banking business and money agency British and Indian, transacted.

J. THOMSON, Chairman.